THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE MOTIVATION OF CHANGES MADE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT BY JUSTIN MARTYR AND CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA: A STUDY IN THE ORIGIN OF NEW TESTAMENT VARIATION

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

ERIC LANE TITUS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JUNE, 1942

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Non-accidental variation as distinguished from accidental
The problem recognized in antiquity
Significance for New Testament research
Limitation of materials for investigation
Ancient attitude toward the text, Canonicity, Inferences, Listing of Categories, A question anticipated, Form

II. HISTORICAL VARIATION 16

Discussion of Historical Variation
Instances of Variation

III. HARMONISTIC VARIATION 20

Discussion of Harmonistic Variation
Instances of Variation

IV. ETHICAL AND PRACTICAL VARIATION 34

Discussion of Ethical and Practical Variation
Instances of Variation--Class A
Instances of Variation--Class B

V. STYLISTIC VARIATION 50

Discussion of Stylistic Variation
Instances of Variation--Class A
Instances of Variation--Class B

VI. EXPLANATORY VARIATION 63

Discussion of Explanatory Variation
Instances of Variation

VII. DOGMATIC VARIATION 68

Discussion of Dogmatic Variation
Instances of Variation--Class A
Instances of Variation--Class B

VIII. CONCLUSION 136

BIBLIOGRAPHY 139

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Historical Variations	19
2.	Harmonistic Variations	33
3.	Ethical and Practical Variations	49
4.	Stylistic Variations	62
5.	Explanatory Variations	67
6.	Dogmatic Variations	133

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The study proposed in this thesis has to do with the motivation of non-accidental variation as this phenomenon is related to the text of the New Testament. New Testament variation is usually considered under two heads, namely, accidental and intentional. Accidental variations are those resulting from the scribe's ignorance, carelessness, fatigue, lack of concentration, and similar factors. Accidental variation is usually given the place of first importance in studies on textual variation. But certain critics have seen that a consideration of non-accidental variation may make a contribution to our knowledge of the primitive text.[1] It is hoped that the present study will demonstrate that change of the non-accidental variety must be taken seriously into account.

As over against accidental change in the text, that of the non-accidental variety must be attributed to certain motives. Sometimes these motives were clearly defined as was the case with Origen when he took liberties with the text for historical reasons. In his discussion of Matthew 27: 45, for example, he argues that history records no such phenomenon as is there set forth. The argument of an eclipse of the sun, moreover, is invalid since the Passover took place at the full moon. Origen holds, therefore, that the phrase, "the sun being eclipsed," was introduced by "the secret enemies of the church of Christ" so that "the Gospels might be attacked with some show of reason." Moreover, the "darkness" of the Gospels was the result of dense clouds collecting above the land of Judaea and Jerusalem so as to obscure the sun's rays. History knows nothing about it because it was merely local in scope. His logical conclusion is that the read-

---

[1] French writers on textual theory like Jacquier, Lagrange, and Goguel have made particularly valuable suggestions in this connection.

ing "the sun being eclipsed," should be omitted from the true text.[1]

This type of variation is clearly evidenced in manuscripts of the Fourth Gospel. In some manuscripts, "the sixth hour" is changed to "the third" in John 19: 14 in order to bring it into accord with Mark 15: 25 as to the hour of crucifixion. And in the same Gospel we have the reading "Do you go up to the feast: I go not up unto this feast."[2] This reading with the negative οὐκ is supported by Codex Sinaiticus and some others. But in Codex Vaticanus and most of the other uncials we read "I go not yet (οὔπω) up to this feast." This change is probably explained as the attempt of copyists to reconcile the words of the Gospel with the fact that Jesus did go up to Jerusalem.

The problem of New Testament non-accidental variation is not a new one as any modern textual critic will attest. Indeed, it was well known to the ancients themselves. Instances may be cited. Gaius, writing at the beginning of the third century, was prompted to write thus:

> These heretics have audaciously corrupted the divine Scriptures under the pretext of correcting them. In order to convince oneself that this is not a false accusation he has only to glance at their exemplars. Those of Asclepiades are entirely different from those of Theodotus. Their disciples have mutilated these corrected copies which in reality are corrupted copies.[3]

Tertullian gives some classic examples. He said of Marcion: "Let the sponge of Marcion blush with shame."[4] Also, "I do not marvel that he took away syllables since he commonly withdrew whole pages. What Pontic mouse was ever such an eater as he who gnaws at the Gospels?"[5]

Sozomen tells the story of a bishop who used the elegant word σκίμπους for κράββατος in John 5: 8 and was rebuked by another with the words, "Are you better than he who spoke the

---

[1] R. B. Tollinton, Selections from the Commentaries and Homilies of Origen (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929), pp. 114-19.

[2] John 7: 8.

[3] E. Jacquier, Le Nouveau Testament dans l'Église chrétienne (Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1911-13), II, 340, 341.

[4] Tertullian Adversus Marcion v. 4. [5] Ibid., i. 1.

word κράββατος , that you are ashamed to use his words?"[1]

Clement of Alexandria accuses "certain people" of changing the text (μετατιθέντων τὰ εὐαγγέλια).[2]

Origen, commenting on Matthew 16: 20, is aware of the difficulty caused by variation in the manuscripts:

> Matthew, according to some of the manuscripts, has written, "Then he commanded His disciples that they should tell no man that He was the Christ," but Mark says, "He charged them that they should tell no man of Him;" and Luke, "He charged them and commanded them to tell this to no man." . ... . You must know, however, that some manuscripts of the Gospel according to Matthew have, "He charged." The difficulty thus started seems to me a very real difficulty.[3]

Jerome recognized the difficulties which he faced in his task of dealing with the great variety of texts. In reply to a request from Pope Damasus that he revise the old Latin version, he said:

> You urge me to revise the old Latin version, and, as it were, to sit in judgment on the copies of the Scriptures which are now scattered throughout the whole world; and, inasmuch as they differ from one another, you would have me decide which of them agree with the Greek original. The labour is one of love, but at the same time both perilous and presumptuous; for in judging others I must be content to be judged by all; and how can I dare to change the language of the world in its hoary old age, and carry it back to the early days of its infancy? Is there a man, learned or unlearned, who will not, when he takes the volume into his hands, and perceives that what he reads does not suit his settled tastes, break out immediately into violent language, and call me a forger and a profane person for having the audacity to add anything to the ancient books, or to make any changes or corrections therein? Now there are two consoling reflections which enable me to bear the odium--in the first place, the command is given by you who are the supreme bishop; and secondly, even on the showing of those who revile, readings at variance with the early copies cannot be right. For if we are to pin our faith to the Latin texts, it is for our opponents to tell us <u>which</u>; for there are almost as many forms of texts as there are copies. If, on the other hand, we are to glean the truth from a comparison of <u>many</u>, why not go back to the original Greek and correct the mistakes introduced by inaccurate translators, and the blundering alterations of confident but ignorant critics, and, further, all that has been inserted or changed by copyists more asleep than awake? I am not discussing the Old Testament, which was turned into Greek by the Seventy Elders

---

[1]Sozomen <u>Ecclesiastical History</u> 11.

[2]Clement <u>Stromata</u> iv. 6.

[3]Origen <u>Commentary on Matthew</u> xii. 15.

> . . . . I am now speaking of the New Testament. This was undoubtedly composed in Greek, with the exception of the work of Matthew the Apostle, who was the first to commit to writing the Gospel of Christ, and who published his work in Judaea in Hebrew characters. We must confess that as we have it in our language, it is marked by discrepancies, and now that the stream is distributed into different channels we must go back to the fountainhead. I pass over those manuscripts which are associated with the names of Lucian and Hesychius, and the authority of which is perversely maintained by a handful of disputatious persons. It is obvious that these writers could not amend anything in the Old Testament after the labours of the Seventy; and it was useless to correct the New, for versions of Scripture which already exist in the languages of many nations show that their additions are false. I therefore promise in this short Preface the four Gospels only, which are to be taken in the following order, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, as they have been revised by a comparison of the Greek manuscripts. Only early ones have been used. But to avoid any great divergences from the Latin which we are accustomed to read, I have used my pen with some restraint, and while I have corrected only such passages as seemed to convey a different meaning, I have allowed the rest to remain as they are.[1]

But while the problem is not a new one, modern scholarship has seen in non-accidental variation a fresh significance for New Testament research. The following statement is an illustration of one aspect of this perception:

> The legitimate task of textual criticism is not limited to the recovery of approximately the original form of the documents, to the establishment of the "best" text, nor to the elimination of "spurious readings": It must be recognized that every significant variant records a religious experience that brought it into being. This means that there are no "spurious readings": the various forms of the text are sources for the study of Christianity.[2]

And it may be added that non-accidental variation is important, not only for the study of Christian history, but also for the study of the primitive text as the goal of that study has been traditionally conceived, namely, the recovery of the original autographs. If the forces back of non-accidental change can be identified and classified it is clear that the accomplishment of this task will be facilitated.

It was conceived that the writings of the Ante-Nicene

---

[1] Jerome, Preface to the Four Gospels. It is to be noted that Jerome made changes in the text.

[2] Donald W. Riddle, "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline," Anglican Theological Review, XVIII (October, 1936), 221.

Fathers might provide a laboratory where these forces could be observed in actual operation. Extensive New Testament quotations and allusions set in an argumentative context, nearness to the time when the text was in its most fluid state were factors which made the idea seem worthy of consideration. If it is possible to discover the motives which prompted these writers to choose one variant as over against another or to produce a new reading, it is legitimate to assume that these forces were not confined to them alone, but were in general operation.

Immediately, however, a difficulty presented itself. The Ante-Nicene literature is so extensive that canvassing of the whole was not conceivable. Some justifiable limitation was therefore necessary. Nevertheless, the selection of material had to be representative and comprehensive enough to warrant its use.

Consideration of the Apostolic Fathers seemed of doubtful value for the purposes of this inquiry. Jacquier speaks of their writings as follows:

> The writings of the Apostolic Fathers offer us few New Testament quotations. In the letter of Clement to the Corinthians, 96-98, we find some blended passages and a few literal quotations, particularly of the Pauline epistles. The Didache is considerably richer in textual quotations, principally from the Gospel of St. Matthew. We also find there combinations of Gospel passages which perhaps originated in an ancient harmony of the sayings of the Lord.
>
> The Epistle of St. Barnabas, the epistles of St. Ignatius, and the Shepherd of Hermas contain numerous passages which call to mind those of the New Testament, but for the most part they do not furnish literal quotations. The Epistle of St. Polycarp, 110-117, contains some of these, but it also shows the same blending of passages as the Epistle of St. Clement. The epistle which is attributed to Clement, but which is probably a homily of the second century, is richer in literal quotations.[1]

Jacquier's emphasis on the degree of literalness of the quotations may, from our point of view, be somewhat overstressed. It is legitimate to ask what constitutes a variant and what a mere allusion. At times the difference is obscure. It may be this strange departure from the familiar or accepted reading that is important. But, in any case, the reading must be identifiable: its original place in the New Testament must be definitely established. This must be followed as a guiding principle. The immediate question is as to how far this is possible in the Apostolic Fathers.

---

[1] Jacquier, op. cit., p. 302.

In this connection, the results of a study by a committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology is most instructive. This committee set out "to prepare a volume exhibiting those passages of early Christian writers which indicate, or have been thought to indicate, acquaintance with any of the books of the New Testament." The writings examined were the following: Barnabas, the Didache, I Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Hermas, II Clement. The books of the New Testament were arranged in four classes "according to the degree of probability of their use by the several authors." The first class includes those about which there was no reasonable doubt, either because they are mentioned or because of other indications of their use. The second class includes those books the use of which, in the editors' estimation, is highly probable. Class three represents a lower degree of probability. The fourth and final class includes books the use of which is too uncertain to permit any reliance to be placed upon them. The results are very interesting. The only New Testament books included in the first class are Romans, Hebrews, and I Peter. The second class shows up somewhat better but is not convincing. The overwhelming number of quotations falls into classes three and four. The conclusion seems to be that in these writers, quotations from the New Testament are too loose and uncertain for the purposes of this study.

Omitting reference, for the moment, to writers of the second century who are not classed with the Apostolic Fathers, we come to a consideration of Origen's writings. Here, the problem is not one of a scarcity of quotation. Quite the contrary, his use of Scripture is extensive; and while he does not always quote with exact literalness, a comparison of his text with that of Westcott and Hort shows a large degree of correspondence. With Origen one moves into a different atmosphere from that of his predecessors. The former spontaneity is gone. There is about his writings a formality far removed from anything offered by the earlier writers. Here, the careful critic is at work. Origen is text-conscious. Tollinton's description of him is a fair one:

> He was the first textual critic. . . . . His interest in textual questions was already formed when he wrote his earliest Commentaries. Throughout, it was his practice to refer to manuscript variations and to the different Greek versions of the Old Testament. . . . . He would on occasion reject a reading which most of the copies known to him supported. He speaks, whatever exactly the expression means,

> of "the more accurate copies." Carelessness in copyists he admits with good reason, and in some cases he refers to intentional alterations of the text. . . . . Origen expressly repudiates the charge of Celsus that the church had tampered with her texts. . . . . No great exegete has wandered further from the actual letter of Scripture than Origen. It is a different feature in his work which confronts us, as we watch him comparing copy with copy, version with version, as we note his efforts to understand the causes of variation in manuscripts.[1]

It will at once be noted that if the foregoing picture is true, the period of spontaneous motivation is passed. This is the picture of a careful critic selecting from a variety of manuscripts, "comparing copy with copy, version with version." Of course changes in the text did not halt abruptly with Origen. Even after the church began to exercise its prerogative as custodian of the "best" text, the growth of dogma would continue to modify it. But the period of spontaneous creativity had passed. His writings, for this reason, fall outside the scope of our investigation.

But lying within this period (which follows that of the Apostolic Fathers but is pre-Origen), are several important Christian leaders and thinkers. This investigation will confine itself to the writings of two of these, namely, Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria. They represent the transition period between the Apostolic Fathers, on the one hand, and the great scholar Origen on the other.

Of the quotations of Justin it must be acknowledged that they display few indications of literalness. It may even be advanced that he usually or always quoted from memory. But this very condition may provide some very useful information as to the employment of Scripture in this period. Exactness of quotation or not, citation from memory or otherwise, the fact remains that this is the way the New Testament was used in this period: the New Testament was made to support the argument, or to put it more correctly, a writer was by his departure reproducing the true text, the original reading of the New Testament.

The only question is as to whether Justin's New Testament quotations are identifiable. A cursory study of Professor Goodspeed's Die Ältesten Apologeten convinces one that this is very frequently the case. He there provides a critical text of three

---

[1] Tollinton, op. cit., pp. xxxvi, xxxvii.

of Justin's works. It is true that in many instances he can only recommend a comparison with New Testament passages, but these are offset by numerous others where identification is accomplished.[1]

Passing to Clement of Alexandria, we note that his writings are very extensive and that he quotes freely from the New Testament. The extensiveness of his writings provides opportunity to check Clement against himself in many instances. As for his New Testament quotations, it is true that he does not always quote "accurately." But here we must be reminded that accuracy is a very relative and tenuous matter. His method of dealing with Scripture throws light upon what Goguel calls the "latent forces" which were at work to modify it. The Alexandrian Father is still in the creative period and is the product of it. It may be added that he is contributing to it. In view of these facts his writings deserve the utmost consideration.

This study will therefore concern itself with the New Testament citations of Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria. Close attention will be given to the first of these writers, but the material provided by Clement will form the main object of our concern.[2]

To the men who dealt with it in this early period, the text was more than a succession of words and letters. Their interest was not that of modern textual criticism on its more mechanical side. For them, the text was a thing of meaning, and that meaning met their own experience at certain points. The text expressed itself on themes running all the way from the doctrine of the divine Logos to injunctions on how to act in the Christian assembly. Between the extremes of sublime and prosaic utterance the text gave expression to a wealth of thought and experience touching life at almost every point. On the other side of the

---

[1]Professor Goodspeed may have been generous in his identification of New Testament passages, but sufficient allowance has been made for this possibility in the above statement.

[2]The possibility of canvassing the writings of Irenaeus was seriously considered by the writer. It was decided, however, that the extant text did not carry with it the assurance necessary for the undertaking. Even when the text is Greek rather than Latin, its purity is not guaranteed, for this may have been modified so as to agree with the text of the Old Latin. Westcott and Hort have finely drawn the limitation in their Introduction, p. 159.

picture, the people of the second century enjoyed an experience as broad as the cosmopolitan character of their environment would signify. It was almost inevitable, therefore, that their experience should not always coincide with that expressed in the New Testament books. These points of difference, the result of cultural influences, the necessity of coming to terms with the world about them, and the development of dogma within the group, represent the points of conflict with the sacred writings.

These early Fathers probably illustrate in their writings the way in which these difficulties were overcome, for they recognized no discrepancy within Scripture itself or between Scripture and the essential facts of their own experience. To appreciate how this gap was bridged it must be borne in mind that this was a period of spontaneity, an era in the history of the text before it had achieved a high degree of fixity, before scholarship had begun its work of introducing some semblance of order. This is why, according to Scrivener, "the worst corruptions to which the New Testament text has ever been subjected originated within a hundred years after it was composed."

The method of quotation employed by our writers is, therefore, important. It is often contended that one method was to resort to memory, with no manuscript check. The result was that faulty memory gave rise to numerous variations from the text of Scripture. That this was so may scarcely be denied. But it is suggested here that in numerous instances where memory was resorted to, the resulting variant was not due to faulty memory alone. Another factor entered in. The context of a given passage may show that the argument advanced by the writer needs the support of the peculiar wording given the New Testament quotation. Whether or not the reading was true to the actual words of the New Testament passage seems to have been a secondary consideration. The spirit, not the words, was the important thing.

The statement which Eusebius attributes to Clement of Alexandria has a bearing on this contention:

> Again, in the same book (Outlines), Clement has set down the tradition of the elders of former days concerning the order of the Gospels, which is to this effect. They were wont to say that of the Gospels those containing the genealogies (Matthew and Luke) were written first. And as regards Mark, they say this was the plan: Peter having preached the word publicly in Rome, and having spoken forth the Gospel by the Spirit, many of those who were then in Rome requested Mark, as one who had attended him for long and remembered what had

> been said, to commit to writing what had been spoken; and that having compared his Gospel, he communicated it to them at their request. This becoming known to Peter, he neither forbade it nor encouraged it; but John, last perceiving that the outward life of Christ [τὰ σωματικά] had been detailed in the Gospel, being encouraged by his intimates, under the inspiration of the Spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel.[1]

Clement, then, was approvingly aware that the author of the Fourth Gospel spiritualized the factual items of the life of Christ. To Clement, as to John, the real Gospel consisted not in the outward life of Christ, but in the deeper meanings to be drawn from it. We may therefore expect to find this point of view reflected in Clement's use of Scripture. He, too, stresses the importance of the "spirit" as over against the literal word.

Actually, from our point of view, this underlying philosophy led to new and curious divergences from the original. And while the ancients themselves did not consider that they were falsifying the sacred text, nevertheless we can see how this freedom was a most effective condition for successful Christian apologetic, and for the establishing of accepted dogmas.

The matter of canonicity is closely related to this early Christian use of Scripture. Generally speaking, it is assumed by scholars that canonicity tended toward exactness of quotation. The Church served as a protection against the inroads of change, conserving the original purity of the sacred text. But it is doubtful if this claim can be supported. Using an example from modern times the acute French scholar Lagrange takes the opposite position:

> We have foolishly enough assumed that these editors were more daring at the beginning because they did not regard the writings as canonical. It was, rather because they held above all to the sense of the words which gave meaning to their life and should give meaning to the life of others. Do we not see today even, the more traditional theologians transcribe the sacred texts less punctiliously than the critics who do not regard them as sacred? Their concern was with the depths where the spirit dwells rather than with the form.[2]

Once this statement by Lagrange is accepted, the degree of canonicity attributed to the New Testament books by our authors becomes, for our purpose, relatively unimportant. For variation will take place in any case.

---

[1] Eusebius Ecclesiastical History vi. 14.

[2] M. J. Lagrange, Critique Textuelle (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1935), II, 23.

If motivation played so important a part in this early period in the writings of the Fathers, we can not assume that they were unique in this regard. May not this judgment be extended so as to include the scribes who transcribed the manuscripts? Every critic of the text agrees that scribes did make such changes in the text. Who, then, can define the limits of this procedure? This question is especially pertinent as applied to this transition period when these "latent forces" were so definitely in operation.

This contention is fortified by the witness of men like Irenaeus and Origen who speak of the diversity of manuscripts existing in their day. Origen is able to write thus:

> But how great in truth has become the diversity of copies, be it from the negligence of certain scribes, or from the evil daring of some who correct what is written, or from them who in correcting add or take away what they think fit.[1]

And it shall be pointed out later at some length that a copyist considered it his sacred duty to make "corrections" in the text.

If what we have said regarding the early Fathers is true, the implications are important for textual criticism. It calls into question one aspect of the use made of the Fathers in the search for the true text, namely, the patristic evidence for readings earlier than themselves. It may be that the emphasis should fall elsewhere. Perhaps these early writers were themselves so completely a part of the process of change that more attention should be paid to the text <u>after</u> them than <u>prior to</u> them. Scrivener poses the question: "Do not the earliest ecclesiastical writers describe readings as existing and current in their own copies, of which few traces can be met with at present?"[2] This is probably true and we may also say that the cumulative effect of a writer's quotations is to give some indication of the nature of the text actually used by him. But it is important to remember that a given variant may or may not imply a lost reading. This conclusion grows out of the early method of using Scripture. It is therefore a fallacy to look merely for an earlier text embodying the variant. It is equally important to

---

[1] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 13.

[2] F. H. A. Scrivener, <u>A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament</u>, ed. Edward Miller (4th ed.; London: George Bell & Sons, 1894), II, 297.

look at the existing texts which came into being after the writer had used the variant. It may even be advanced that the coincidence of reading between the writer and certain manuscripts as over against still other authorities may be due to the fact that by using the variant he succeeded in giving it prominence and popularity or introduced it himself.

But perhaps the safer and more important base is the total situation in which these motivating forces were active. It may be impossible to establish the relation between a variant reading that is found earliest in a work of a given Father and its inclusion in later manuscripts. But it is safe to say that the total situation of which he was a part succeeded in giving it importance enough to warrant its inclusion in the manuscripts. When variation occurs, therefore, it is necessary not only to consult the preponderance of manuscripts and the "best" manuscripts, but also to take into account as tools the motivating forces which were present in this early, fluid, transitional period. This method should be an integral part of any attempt to determine the original autographs of the New Testament books.

Judged on the basis of dominant motivation the New Testament variants in the writings of Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria fall into distinct categories. Proceeding through these writings book by book we have discovered that these categories may be designated as historical, harmonistic, ethical and practical, stylistic, explanatory, and dogmatic. This list might be extended by a broader sampling of early Christian literature than has been undertaken here, but it probably includes the more important motivations for variation.

It will be observed that these categories, for the most part, are not new. Textual critics have been aware of them in the history of manuscript transmission, and have given them some consideration. But this attention has not been considerable, and it is this lack of emphasis that gives the present listing increased importance. What has largely been taken to be the more or less sporadic and arbitrary work of scribes in consciously changing the text assumes a broader base in the Sitz im Leben. The process of change may have been more intimately related to the experience of people than is usually assumed.

From this point of view, it will be recognized that "important" variants are not our concern any more than are those

recorded in the books on textual criticism as "slight." Our concern is to illustrate a principle, to bear witness to actual forces operating in the life of the people to modify the New Testament text. In this process, the so-called unimportant variation may provide real evidence. Indeed we may go further and say that the "unimportant" variant may demonstrate that the process of motivation was as broad as the experience of the people who handled the text. Not only were the great themes and dogmas of religion involved, but also the matters of everyday experience. Clement, in his antagonism to ornamentation, illustrates this very clearly.

One question may be anticipated: Is it not necessary for one first to know the text actually used by the early Fathers before he can speak of variation either of the accidental or non-accidental variety?

The answer involves several factors. In the first place, our concern is not with how a given writer varied from a standard text, as, for example, that of Tischendorf, although that does serve as a convenient tool of comparison. We are interested, rather, in the degree of departure from or correlation with the readings of the various manuscripts. We do not start out with the preconceived notion, for example, that Clement had before him a text of the western variety. As a matter of fact, all of the readings as represented by the textual apparatus must be assessed. This makes possible a judgment as to the uniqueness of a given reading, whether or not it was known somewhat generally, to a more limited extent, or was, apparently, a new creation. It also provides a clue to the antiquity of the reading; whether or not it existed prior to the writer concerned. Also, to what extent it was used after him.

In the second place, a writer may very often be checked against himself. The result is that one can usually judge the reading which lay in the text as distinct from the non-accidental departure.

Finally, the context in which the quotation is found provides a most important guide. The ancients did not start with a text of Scripture and then proceed systematically and scientifically to develop its meaning, being careful never to depart from its <u>intended</u> meaning. Allegorical interpretation is sufficient evidence to the contrary. They started with an all-important

dogma and utilized Scripture to show that it was true. Hence, when any ancient writer contends vociferously for a point, we must be on the alert for changes in the words of Scripture passages which he brings in to support it. This, it must be emphasized, was not to him misuse of Scripture, any more than the early use of allegory was a misuse of the sacred writings. But its effect on the text was the same. The point to be noted is that the dogma produced changes in the New Testament text. If the words of the text are not changed to conform to the dogma, then elaborate "interpretations" are given which explain away the discrepancy. Or, very frequently, allegorical interpretation resolves the conflict of ideas.

The Greek texts used in this thesis are the following: Goodspeed's Die ältesten Apologeten, 1914, for the quotations of Justin Martyr, and Stählin's Clemens Alexandrinus in Die griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller series, 1905, 1906, 1909, for Clement of Alexandria. The excellence of both of these needs no elaboration. We are not unaware of the possibility of error even here. Nevertheless, having these critical texts at our disposal made it possible to approach our task with a high degree of confidence. It has been found convenient to place the quotations from the New Testament found in the Patristic literature in a position where they may be compared to a standard text. It has been thought well to use Tischendorf's Novum Testamentum Graece, Volumes I and II, 1869, 1872, especially in view of the fact that the critical apparatus which this supplies has been used extensively.

The classification of the variants which are noted in this thesis has assumed the following form. Each category has been divided, when possible, into two divisions. The examples which appear to be conclusive are placed in the division specified as "A," while those less convincing have been assigned to the section designated "B." The divisions, however, must not be considered binding since the inclusion of a variant in one or the other has been the result of an all too fallible judgment. The fact is that an example from "B" may be as important as one from "A," but on the whole those of the former are less convincing. A three-fold reference has been given at the end of each chapter making possible ready access to the discussion of a particular variant. Sometimes the motivation seems to be mixed and when

this is the case a footnote to the effect is introduced. Each category is prefaced by a discussion of the particular motivation under consideration. It will serve as background material against which the variants listed may be studied. The writer does not claim to have discovered all of the non-accidental variations in the writings of these two early Christians, but he does claim to have tried to canvass those which seemed to him to hold any degree of importance for his purpose.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL VARIATION

Discussion of Historical Variation

As far as the writings of Justin and Clement are concerned, this classification does not stand well represented. The instance noted in this thesis may have other than historical significance. Chronological schemes as set forth in these early Fathers usually do have motivations other than those of historical accuracy and interest. Undoubtedly, however, the historical interest was to some degree present in those early years and exerted a degree of influence upon the text. It may be that the change from οὐ to οὔπω in John 7: 8 has historical as well as harmonistic motivation. The variants Γεργεσηνῶν and Γαδαρηνῶν of Matthew 8: 28, and Βηθαβαρᾶ and Βηθανία of John 1: 28 may have a connection with this historical motivation. And a statement like the following which relates to the variant reading of John 19: 14 and emphasizes the accuracy of certain texts lends support to this category:

> And it was the preparation about the third hour, as the accurate books have it, and the autograph copy itself by the Evangelist John, which up to this day by divine grace has been preserved in the most holy church of Ephesus, and is there adored by the faithful.[1]

Peter, however, comes from a period somewhat later than our transition age and may not fairly represent our writers. It is probable that the historical interest developed more strongly with the work of men like Origen who used what more nearly approaches the techniques of modern textual criticism.[2]

---

[1] Fragments from the writings of Peter of Alexandria, The Ante-Nicene Fathers (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1886), VI, 283.

[2] Cf. Scrivener, op. cit., p. 12: "The variations between Γεργεσηνων and Γαδαρηνων Matt. 8: 28, and between Βηθαβαρα and Βηθανια John 1: 28 have been attributed, we should hope unjustly, to the misplaced conjectures of Origen." But Scrivener's may indeed be an idle hope. There is reason to believe that Origen's

Goguel gives several examples of what he calls corrections of physical errors or contradictions of fact which we might perhaps consider in this present relation.

Matt. 5: 39: δεξιάν is omitted by D k Syr^{s} because one would most naturally hit the left cheek. But it is to be noted that the Talmud says that the back-handed blow is the most insulting.

Luke 6: 1: δευτεροπρώτῳ omitted by Aleph B C L as unintelligible.

Luke 23: 32: c e Syr^{s} omit ἕτεροι before δύο κακοῦργοι.

Romans 5: 1: the indicative replaces the subjunctive.

I Cor. 15: 49.[1]

Instances of Historical Variation

Example 1

Strom. i. 21	Luke 3: 23
Ἦν δὲ Ἰησους ἐρχόμενος ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὡς ἐτῶν λ΄.	Καὶ αὐτος ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα.

This verse of Luke has always been a difficult one for the translators. The Authorized Version reads: "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age," which reading scarcely makes sense. The American Revised has: "And Jesus, himself, when he began to teach was about thirty years of age . . . ." Moffatt gives: "At the outset Jesus was about thirty years of age." The Twentieth Century New Testament translates: "When beginning his work Jesus was about thirty years old." Goodspeed renders it about the same: "Jesus himself was about thirty years old when he began his work."

---

discussion in his Commentary on John, chapter 24, may have had an effect on the text. It should be noted that while Origen hints that some of the manuscripts omit Bethany, he does not say that they read Bethabara. His appeal is rather to geography and history. Furthermore, this geographical and historical basis is the only one used in his argument for Gergesenes. He makes no mention of manuscript evidence for this.

[1]Maurice Goguel, Le texte et les éditions du Nouveau Testament grec (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1920), p. 64. These examples do not properly belong in this category, but since Goguel thinks of them as "physical errors or contradictions of fact," they may for convenience be placed here. The omission of ἕτεροι seems to have a dogmatic bearing, while the omission of δευτεροπρώτῳ could be termed "explanatory."

Clement disposes of any difficulty by a direct statement to the effect that "Jesus was coming to his baptism, being about thirty years old." In doing so he changes ἀρχόμενος to ἐρχόμενος and adds ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα. He thus makes it clear that Luke had in mind the time of Jesus' baptism. Furthermore, he is able to show that Jesus' ministry lasted only one year by quoting Isaiah 51: 1, 2. He is aware of Luke's rendering of this passage: τοῦτο καὶ ὁ προφήτης εἶπεν καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον: "He hath sent me to proclaim the acceptable year (ἐνιαυτὸν) of the Lord." He takes ἐνιαυτὸν to refer to a definite period of one year in length. At the end of that time Jesus was put to death, that is, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. Counting back thirty years brings him to the birth date of Jesus in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of Augustus. This is what he is endeavoring to prove. The argument runs:

> And our Lord was born in the twenty-eighth year, when first the census was ordered to be taken in the reign of Augustus. And to prove that this is true, it is written in the Gospel by Luke as follows: "And in the fifteenth year, in the reign of Tiberius Caesar, the word of the Lord came to John, the son of Zacharias." And again in the same book: "And Jesus was coming to his baptism, being about thirty years old," and so on. And that it was necessary for him to preach only a year, this also is written: "He hath sent me to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." This both the prophet spake and the Gospel. Accordingly, in fifteen years of Tiberius and fifteen years of Augustus; so were completed the thirty years till the time He suffered.

Barnard has noted the following facts in connection with this variant: Ephraem's Commentary on the Diatessaron has: "And Jesus himself was about thirty years of age when he came to be baptized of John." Referring to the words of Matthew 3: 1, "In those days," Barsalbi says "In those days" does not mean the days when our Lord was returning from Egypt to Nazareth, but during the time he was at Nazareth. "For the number of the years was twenty-five, because when thirty years old He came to baptism, as saith Luke." But Burkitt expresses doubt, in view of the context, whether stress can be laid on this as illustrating the reading ἐρχόμενος.

An apparently conflate reading is found in Irenaeus:

> Ad baptismum enim uenit nondum qui triginta annos suppleuerat, sed qui inciperet esse tanquam triginta annorum: (ita enim, qui eius annos significauit Lucas posuit: Iesus autem erat quasi incipiens triginta annorum, cum ueniret ad baptismum).

And Aphraates has:

> Joseph thirty years old stood before Pharaoh, and became a lord unto Egypt. And Jesus about thirty years old came to the Jordan to be baptized, and received the spirit and went forth to preach.[1]

Very likely this variant grew out of the desire in the early church to determine a satisfactory chronology. The length of Clement's discussion bearing on this matter in the Stromata shows how elaborately chronological schemes were formulated.

TABLE 1

HISTORICAL VARIATIONS

Thesis Page	Patristic Literature	New Testament
17	Strom. 1. 21. 145 (407)	Luke 3: 23

[1] P. M. Barnard, The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria (Cambridge: The University Press, 1899), p. 38.

CHAPTER III

HARMONISTIC VARIATION

Discussion of Harmonistic Variation

The tendency to harmonize the various accounts and ideas of Scripture was inevitable. There is, for one thing, the bent of the human mind for unity. This, we may be sure, was present in the ancient world as well as in the modern. And working with it was the theory that Scripture cannot contradict itself. That which seemed to do so was only apparent, not real. As far as the New Testament is concerned the gospel was not several but one. The four or more accounts are but aspects of the one. There can be no fundamental contradiction. Apparent contradictions could be reconciled by changes here and there in the text, by allegorizing, and spiritualizing. For the real truth of Scripture is not to be found in the outward and material letter.

Origen, speaking of contradiction in Scripture, says:

> I do not condemn them [the four Evangelists] if they even sometimes dealt freely with things which to the eye of history happened differently, and charged them so as to subserve the mystical aims they had in view; so as to speak of a thing which happened in a certain place, as if it had happened in another, or of what took place at a certain time, as if it had taken place at another time, and to introduce into what was spoken in a certain way some changes of their own. They proposed to speak the truth where it was possible both materially and spiritually, and where this was not possible it was their intention to prefer the spiritual to the material. . . . . Statements which are verbally contrary to each other, are made about our Lord, namely, that he was descended from David and that he was not descended from David. The statement is true, "He was descended from David" . . . . if we apply this to the bodily part of Him; but the self-same statement is untrue if we understand His being born of the seed of David of his diviner power. . . . . Marcion, I suppose, took sound words in a wrong sense, when he rejected His birth from Mary, and declared that as to His divine nature He was not born of Mary, and hence made bold to delete from the Gospel the passages which have this effect.[1]

The attempts of the copyist to bring Scriptural accounts

---

[1] Origen. Commentary on John x. 14.

into harmony with one another often resulted in textual variation. We find evidences of this motivation in the manuscripts. Some change "the sixth hour" of John 19: 14 to "the third hour" in order to bring the statement of the writer more into accord with Mark 15: 25 as to the hour of the crucifixion. Another example of this tendency is found in John 7: 8 where the reading "I go not (οὐ) up to the feast" is changed to "I go not yet (οὔπω) up to the feast." This change makes it agree with the fact stated just two verses later that Jesus did go to the feast mentioned.

There is another phenomenon to be noted in this connection, namely, that the New Testament must agree with the Old. This is beautifully illustrated by Origen. Writing on the words from Matthew, "Blessed are the peacemakers," he says that a man becomes a peacemaker as he

> demonstrates that that which appears to others to be a conflict in the Scriptures is no conflict, and exhibits their concord and peace, whether of the Old Scriptures with the New, or of the Law with the Prophets, or of the Gospels with the Apostolic Scriptures, or of the Apostolic Scriptures with each other. . . . . For he knows that all the Scripture is the one perfect and harmonized instrument of God, which from different sounds gives forth one saving voice to those willing to learn. . . . .[1]

On harmonization within the New Testament Goguel gives the following list:[2]

Matt. 4: 10] 16: 23
Luke 1: 28] 1: 42
Acts 9: 5] 26: 14
Matt. 11: 19] Luke 5: 35
Matt. 27: 49] John 19: 34
Mark 15: 3] Matt. 27: 12
Luke 23: 38] John 19: 20
John 1: 23] Mark 1: 3
Matt. 4: 18] Mark 1: 16
By omission (rare) Luke 23: 34
Matt. 16: 17] John 1: 42; 21: 15, 16, 17
Matt. 27: 35] John 19: 24
Mark 14: 70] Matt. 26: 73
Mark 15: 28] Luke 22: 37
Luke 24: 40] John 20: 20
John 19: 14] Mark 15: 25

---

[1] Origen Commentary on Matthew ii.

[2] Maurice Goguel, Le texte et les éditions du Nouveau Testament grec (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1920), pp. 60 ff.

Instances of Harmonistic Variation

Example 1

Ap. 1. 15. 10	Matt. 5: 42, 46
Παντὶ τῳ αἰτοῦντι δίδοτε καὶ τὸν βουλόμενον δανείσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆτε. εἰ γὰρ δανείζετε λαβεῖν τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιοῦσιν.	τῳ αἰτοῦντί σε δός, καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανίσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς. οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν;

This very much mixed combination in Justin, together with the reading τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε[1] has led Bousset to the conclusion that Justin had a pre-canonical source for it.[2] While one hesitates to take issue with so outstanding a scholar, a suggestion may not be out of place. Justin is interested here in the teachings of Jesus. To give them in various combinations would not violate any canon of Scriptural usage. He was interested in the spirit more than in the form. The union, then, of the sections of Matthew and Luke would not disturb him and completes the sequence of thought. Concerning the pericope τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιοῦσιν, this is placed in an entirely new context. In Matthew the verse reads ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι οὕτως ποιοῦσιν. But what so natural as to associate the publicans with a statement having to do with borrowing and receiving? These brief formulae, including either οἱ λησταὶ, οἱ τελῶναι, οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ, were in all probability used in many and varied connections.[3] In this instance Justin makes it clear by his usage that the morality of the Christians is far above that commonly associated with the publicans.

This matter of combination and harmonization may be carried further. The similarity between the Synoptics would tend to make this phenomenon common. Added to this was the fact that while there were several Gospels in existence, there was only one gospel. What difference from which Gospel or Gospels, the gospel

---

[1]The same motivation is present here as in another usage of the phrase; infra, p. 77.

[2]Wilhelm Bousset, Evangeliencitate Justins des Martyrers (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1891), p. 79.

[3]Theophilus: τουτο και οι λησται και τελωναι ποιουσιν.

was derived? Yet the difference between the Gospels was sufficient to produce entirely new readings. Were not the early harmonies (e.g., that of Tatian) merely attempts to place the gospel in one instead of in several forms?

This is what has happened in chapter 15. Time and time again combinations of Matthew and Luke appear. Bousset is sure that this shows a pre-canonical text in use by Justin which contained these various readings. He points out, for example, that Justin uses practically the same readings in both the Apology and the Dialogue with Trypho; also that similar combinations appear in several of the early writers.[1] But, on the other hand, Westcott held that our Gospels together with oral tradition are sufficient to account for Justin's Scriptural renderings. This position is made stronger by the fact that the drift of the argument could very well call to mind the more apt words and phrases in existence, whether in written or in oral form.

Example 2

Ap. i. 33. 5	Luke 1: 31, 32; Matt. 1: 20, 21
Ἰδοὺ συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν.	Καὶ ἰδοὺ συλλήμψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται.

Justin's rendering, as such, appears nowhere in the Gospels. It is a combination of approximate readings from Luke and Matthew. The phrase ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου is added for an obvious reason. As a matter of fact the entire quotation is the result of an attempt to show that in accordance with Isaiah 7: 14, Jesus was miraculously conceived of a virgin:

> This, then, "Behold a virgin shall conceive," signifies that a virgin should conceive without intercourse. For if she had had intercourse with any one whatever, she was no longer a virgin; but the power of God having come upon the virgin overshadowed her, and caused her while yet a virgin to conceive. And the angel of God who was sent to the same virgin at that time brought her good news, saying, "Behold thou shalt conceive of the Holy Ghost, and shall bear a Son and He shall be called the Son of the Highest, and they shall call His name Jesus; for He shall save His people from their sins.

---

[1] Bousset, op. cit., pp. 80 ff.

In this manner various Gospel passages are brought into harmony with one another, and then made to conform to Old Testament prediction. This assimilation or correction of New Testament passages to Old Testament predictions is a common feature in the works of the early Fathers.

Example 3

Ap. i. 38. 8	Matt. 27: 39, 40; cf. Mark 15: 29; Luke 23: 35
σταυρωθέντος γὰγ αὐτοῦ ἐξέστρεφον τὰ χείλα καὶ ἐκίνουν τὰς κεφαλὰς λέγοντες· Ὁ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείρας ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν.	οἱ δὲ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτόν, κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες· Ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν[1] καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις οἰκοδομῶν, σῶσον σεαυτόν.

In the Dialogue with Trypho we have Πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντές με ἐξεμυκτήρισαν με, καὶ ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλήν· Ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ κύριον ῥυσάσθω αὐτον. . . . Υἱον θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγε, καταβὰς περιπατείτω· σωσάτω αὐτὸν ὁ θεός.

In the first place, we notice that Psalm 22 has exerted a strong influence on the allusion and quotation here set forth. The phrase ἐξέστρεφον τὰ χείλα καὶ ἐκίνουν τὰς κεφαλὰς is most certainly due to the influence of this Psalm, which Justin quotes both in the First Apology and in the Dialogue. The quotation from the Dialogue runs as follows:

> Our fathers trusted in Thee; they trusted and Thou didst deliver them. . . . . All they that see me laugh me to scorn; they spake with their lips, they shook the head: He trusted in the Lord; let Him deliver him, since he desires Him. . . . . For they that saw Him crucified shook their heads each of them, and distorted their lips, and twisting their noses to each other, they spake in mockery the words which are recorded in the memoirs of His apostles: "He said he was the Son of God: let him come down and walk; let God save him."[2]

The phrase ὁ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείρας seems to have as its background the interpretation of the words attributed to Jesus by the writer of the Fourth Gospel: "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up."[3] The interpretation was that Jesus

---

[1] ναὸν: a, b, c, f, ff[1.2], g[2], q, vg. cop. syr.[hr] Or. Hil. Hier. add dei.

[2] Justin Dialogue 101. 3.

[3] John 2: 19.

spoke "of the temple of his body,"[1] making it a reference to the resurrection. Here, however, it is made to apply to Jesus' ability to raise the dead. Psalm 22, quoted by Justin, has also had its effect: "And I lay down and slept, and rose again, because the Lord sustained me."[2]

In the Dialogue, Justin does not give the same words in the quotation. As we have seen he has, "He called himself the Son of God. Let him come down and walk. Let God save him." The addition "and walk" is an interesting one. Justin refers it to the "Memoirs," and they may have contained it. It is to be observed, in any case, that the whole context of chapter 102 which follows the quotation has to do with the problem as to why God did not save Christ. Justin has in mind the fact of immediate deliverance from the Cross. Ultimately, from the Christian point of view, Christ was saved by means of the resurrection. Perhaps the addition, "Let Him come down and walk. Let God save Him," was intended to make clear the reference to an immediate as over against the ultimate deliverance of Christ. This deliverance, Justin goes on to affirm, would violate the principle of free-will, and would contradict Scriptural prediction. The moral drawn from God's refusal to deliver Christ in this fashion is this: If Christ, the Son of God, and sinless cannot thus be saved, how much less can a Jew (Trypho), who does not possess the Christian hope.

Example 4

Dial. 88. 8; cf. 103. 6	Luke 3: 22; cf. Matt. 3: 17 Mark 1: 11; Ps. 2: 7
Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.	Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

Justin states explicitly that this quotation is also from "David," that is, from Psalm 2. But he also implies that when David uttered the words he was anticipating the very experience of the baptism. Most of the discussion of this strange reading is centered about it as it occurs in chapter 103. This is unfortunate. As the present writer sees it, the key to an understand-

---

[1] John 2: 21.

[2] Justin Apology i. 38.

ing of its usage is found in chapter 88. This will be clear as we proceed.

To begin with, it must be remembered that Justin represents himself as debating with a Jew. That fact immediately suggests the aptness of appeal to the Old Testament. That appeal is at once confirmed by the contents of the Dialogue. If he can show that Old Testament prophecy has been fulfilled in Jesus he will have won his point. He, therefore, in this section places before Trypho the various ways in which Jesus has met the requirements of Scripture. Jesus did not need to be empowered by any divine visitation:

> For it was not His entrance into Jerusalem sitting on an ass, which we have showed was prophecied, that empowered Him to be Christ, but it furnished men with a proof that he is the Christ; just as it was necessary in the time of John that men have proof, that they might know who is Christ. For when John remained (sat) by the Jordan and preached the baptism of repentance . . . . he cried to them "I am not the Christ. . . . . And when Jesus came to the Jordan, He was considered to be the son of Joseph the carpenter; and he appeared without comeliness as the Scriptures declared; and he was deemed a carpenter . . . . . But then the Holy Ghost, and for man's sake, as I formerly stated, lighted on Him, in the form of a dove and there came at the same instant from the heavens a voice, personating Christ, what the Father would say to Him: "Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten Thee"; saying that his generation would take place for men, at the time when they would become acquainted with Him: "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee."
>
> Then Trypho remarked, "Be assured that all our nation waits for Christ; and we admit that all the Scriptures which you have quoted refer to Him."

Obviously, then, it is the nature of Justin's argument which prompted him to use the words of the Psalm.[2] Moreover, he turns the phrase, "This day have I begotten thee," from a liability into an asset. This is the very sign to the Jews that Jesus is the long-hoped-for Messiah. It is not that Jesus "became" Son in a special sense at the baptism. He had been that right along. This experience took place in order that men might become aware of what he was, and in accordance with Scripture. The expression, "this day have I begotten thee," was a correction

---

[1] Justin Dialogue 88. 5 ff.

[2] A dogmatic motivation may often be behind harmonization to the Old Testament. But in Justin there seems definitely to be no reference to "adoptionism." It is interesting to note, then, that this reading ("this day have I begotten thee"), may not always be attributed to that early controversy.

of "in whom I am well pleased" which carried no special distinction.

Of the many writers consulted on this quotation, only one has seen the possibility set forth here. Kaye has the following:

> In this passage Justin appears to have referred to Luke 3: 22; 4: 8, but, quoting from memory to have cited the words of Psalm 2: 7 instead of Luke 3: 22. Is there not also reason for suspecting that Justin, in arguing with a Jew, might think that he added weight to his argument by substituting for the actual words of the Gospel, words from the Old Testament, which the Jews interpreted of the Messiah.[1]

It will be noted that this wording of Justin is also found in Luke 3: 22 according to D and in certain Latin manuscripts: a b c ff_2 l. It is also found in the Gospel of the Ebionites.[2] Westcott contends that the material common to both Justin and this Gospel must have been borrowed from a third source.[3] Other writers referring these words to the baptism are Clement of Alexandria,[4] Methodius,[5] Lactantius,[6] Juvencus,[7] and Augustine.[8]

Purves points out that Augustine knew the reading was to be found in some codices of Luke, but was said not to be found in the more ancient codices. His (Purves') own judgment is that "either Justin's manuscript had this Western corruption, or he had heard it thus quoted and relied on his memory."[9] But there is the further possibility that the argument itself motivated the reading, and was used by the other writers, becoming incorporated in certain manuscripts.

We may mention in this connection, though one cannot be sure how much it figured in Justin's thinking, a peculiar explanation of the baptism of Jesus. It seems to have been shared by

---

[1]John Kaye, Apology of Justin Martyr (Edinburgh: J. Grant, 1912), pp. 105 f.

[2]Epiphanius Against Heresies xxx. 13.

[3]B. F. Westcott, The Canon of the New Testament (6th ed.; Cambridge: Macmillan & Company, 1889), p. 160, n. 1.

[4]Clement Paedagogue i. 6. [5]Methodius Discourse viii. 9.

[6]Lactantius Divine Institutes iv. 15.

[7]Juvencus Historia Evangelica i. 363.

[8]Augustine Enchiridion 49.

[9]G. T. Purves, The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity (New York: A. D. F. Randolf and Company, 1889), p. 185.

Gnostic and orthodox alike. The explanation was to the effect that while the Christian Savior needed no baptism, he was baptized in order that he might consecrate the water and make it efficacious for those who, through baptism, should be reborn:

> Now regeneration is by water and spirit, as was all creation: "For the Spirit of God moved on the abyss." And for this reason the Savior was baptized, though not himself needing to be so, in order that he might consecrate the whole water for those who were being regenerated.[1]

Example 5

Dial. 101. 3	Matt. 27: 42, 43; cf. Mark 15: 29, 30; Luke 23: 35
Υἱὸν θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγε καταβὰς περιπατείτο. σωσάτω ὁ θεός.	Βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐστιν, καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ πιστεύσωμεν ἐπ' αὐτόν· πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ρυσάσθω νῦν εἰ θέλει αὐτόν· εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι θεοῦ εἰμὶ υἱός.

It is important to notice how anxious Justin is to have the events of Jesus' crucifixion coincide with the words of Old Testament prophecy.[2] An illustration of this is to be found in the First Apology 35, when Justin has those about the cross cry "Judge us." Thus, the words of Isaiah 53: 2, "ask of me judgment," are literally fulfilled. Again in the First Apology 38, Psalm 21: 7 has determined his choice of language. The same phenomenon is to be observed in cahpter 101 of the Dialogue and is our particular concern here. The tendency to conform with Old Testament prophecy has passed over from the general discussion into the New Testament quotation itself: "He said he was the Son of God: let him come down; let God save him." This is borne out by the whole emphasis of the chapter, namely, trust in the Father. It is significant that scholars refer this quotation primarily to Matthew rather than to Mark or Luke. The temper of the phrase, "save thyself" which belongs to Mark or "let him save himself" which is Luke's way of putting it, is foreign to the thought of this chap-

---

[1] Clement Eclogae Propheticae 7.

[2] I suppose that this is due to the circumstance that the cross was a most difficult and embarrassing factor to rationalize. But if the Old Testament could be shown to make specific reference to it as all part of a divine plan, the difficulty would, in large measure, be resolved.

ter. Justin's own position is: "And he foretells that he shall be saved by the same God, but boasts not in accomplishing anything through his own will or might." In this context, the phrase σωσάτω αὐτὸν ὁ θεός, is a most natural one.

This possibility has not passed entirely without recognition. Kaye notes the relationship to the Psalm. He quotes the passage and remarks: "Justin in this instance has evidently in quoting from memory, mixed up with Matthew 27: 42, words from Psalm 21: 7, to which he has just referred."[1] And Westcott at least mentions "the object which he (Justin) had in view" as having some significance in explaining the variation from Matthew.[2]

Example 6

Dial. 103. 8	Luke 22: 44; cf. Matt. 26: 39
ἱδρὼς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεκεῖτο.	Καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἱδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι ἅιματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

The particular item to be noted here is the omission of the word ἅιματος. Westcott makes the following comment in this connection:

> The omission of the word ἅιματος was probably suggested by the passage in Psalm 22: 14 which Justin is explaining. It cannot have arisen from any Docetic tendency as the whole context shows. The entire pericope (vv. 43, 44) is omitted by very important authorities but I cannot find that ἅιματος alone is omitted elsewhere than in Justin.[3]

I think that there can be no doubt that the introduction of ἅιματος into the discussion would ruin his argument from the Old Testament Psalm. The passage from the Psalm pertinent to the discussion runs as follows:

> I am poured out like water,
> And all my bones are out of joint:
> My heart is like wax;
> It is melted within me.

Since the simile of the Psalm includes the phrase "like water," the inclusion of ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι ἅιματος "as drops of blood" would

---

[1] Kaye, op. cit., p. 105.

[2] Westcott, op. cit., p. 134. [3] Ibid., p. 115, n. 1.

be to nullify his argument.[1]

It is to be noted that the reference to the bloody sweat is omitted by Aleph (a) A B N . . . . Syr^{s}.

The argument advanced above seems quite conclusive in the light of the context:

> The statement, "All my bones are poured out and dispersed like water; my heart has become like wax, melting in the midst of my belly," was a prediction of that which happened to Him on that night when men came out against Him to the Mount of Olives to seize Him. For in the memoirs which I say were drawn up by His apostles, and those who followed them, [it is recorded] that His sweat fell down like drops while He was praying, and saying, "If it be possible, let this cup pass."

Example 7

Dial. 112. 4	Matt. 23: 27, 24
Τάφοι κεκονιαμένοι, ἔξωθεν φαινόμενοι ὡραῖοι καὶ ἔσωθεν γέμοντες ὀστέων νεκρῶν, τὸ ἡδύοσμον ἀποδεκατοῦντες, τὴν δὲ κάμελον καταπίνοντες τυφλοὶ ὁδηγοί;	Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι παρομοιάζετε τάφοις κεκονιαμένοις, οἵτινες ἔξωθεν μὲν φαίνονται ὡραῖοι, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ὀστέων νεκρῶν καὶ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας. ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοί, διϋλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα, τὴν δὲ κάμηλον καταπίνοντες.

This combination is found, with some variation, in chapter 17 of the Dialogue. It is an example, as Westcott has pointed out, of a combination of different passages consisting "more in the intermixture of forms than of words."[2] The reason for this combination is probably to be traced to Justin's desire to utter in short, concise fashion the words attributed to Jesus which are so filled with scathing power directed against the Jewish religious leaders.

In this connection there are two factors to be noticed. The first is that Justin is engaged in a most intense polemic against the Jews. This is especially true in chapter 17, where

---

[1] The omission of ἄιματος in the manuscripts is usually attributed to docetic influences. It is instructive to note here one other reason for the omission: since the Old Testament predicted the suffering of Christ, it was not necessary to minimize or otherwise account for it.

[2] Westcott, op. cit., p. 146.

statements like the following appear:

> For other nations have not inflicted on us and on Christ this wrong to such an extent as you have, who in very deed are the authors of the wicked prejudice against the Just One, and us who hold by Him.
>
> You are the cause, not only of your own unrighteousness but in fact that of all other men.

This being the case, what more fitting than that Christ's most crushing condemnatory words should be joined in the fashion appearing here. And the opening words of chapter 18 would indicate his desire for this combination and condensation.[1]

Fitting in with this is the second fact that Justin omits παρομοιάζετε or any similar construction. His omission seems to be the result of his desire to strengthen the language. The Jewish teachers are not merely <u>like</u> whited sepulchres, they <u>are</u> whited sepulchres. Westcott's discussion of the passage is striking enough to warrant its inclusion here almost in full:

> False teachers are no longer like to whited sepulchres; they <u>are</u> very sepulchres. The change is striking. If this be explained, the participial form of the sentence creates no new difficulty, but follows as a natural sequence. The text of St. Matthew, however, offers no trace of its origin. There indeed in different authorities three different expressions of comparison παρομοιάζετε, ὁμοιάζετε, ὅμοί ἐστε-- are found, but none omit it. Clement and Irenaeus give the passage with a very remarkable variation,[2] but they agree with the Manuscripts in preserving the connexion. The Naassenes or Ophites, according to the Treatise against Heresies attributed to Hippolytus, quoted the saying in a form more similar to that of Justin but with an additional change: "Ye are whited tombs (Christ) says, full within of dead bones". Here the passing characteristic is transformed into a substantive description. The clue to the solution of the difficulty which arises from the various modifications of the Lord's saying must be sought for in St. Luke. He has not indeed a single word in common with Justin, but he has expressed the thought--at least according to very weighty evidence--in the same manner:[3] "Woe to you, for ye are unseen tombs, and men when they walk over them know it not." Justin has thus clothed the living image of St. Luke in the language of St. Matthew.[4]

---

[1]The passage runs: "I do not think I have done foolishly in adding some short utterances of His to the prophetic statements."

[2]Clement: εξωθεν ο ταφος φαινεται ωραιος ενδον δε γεμει. Irenaeus: <u>A foris enim sepulchrum apparet formosum intus autem est . . . .</u>

[3]Luke 11: 44: D, a, b, c, d, e, ff^2, Syr. Cur. Lucif. omitting ως. But Tischendorf reads ως.

[4]Westcott, <u>op. cit.</u>, pp. 147 f.

But the point to be observed is that in doing so Justin has changed the original reading and that this goes back ultimately to the purpose that he himself has in mind as he pursues his argument.

One further fact may be observed. It is the omission of οἱ διϋλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα, even though τὴν δὲ κάμηλον καταπίνοντες is included. The reason for this phenomenon is suggested by the context which immediately precedes the quotation:

> But if your teachers only expound to you why female camels are spoken of in this passage and are not in that;[1] or why so many measures of fine flour and so many measures of oil [are used] in the offerings; and do so in a low and sordid manner . . . .; will they not deserve to hear what our Lord Jesus Christ said to them.

Then follows the Scriptural quotation. It is the use of the word "camel" here which probably suggested the quotation. Kaye lends his support to this point of view. "The camel," he says, "fits paragraph 4." Paragraph 4, to which he refers, is quoted above.[2] But the same cannot be said of τὸν κώνωπα, "the gnat."

---

[1]Gen. 32: 15.

[2]This might indeed be listed as variation of the "practical" variety since it grows out of the practical necessities of logical argument as they were conceived.

TABLE 2

HARMONISTIC VARIATIONS

Thesis Page	Patristic Literature	New Testament
22	Ap. i. 15. 10	Matt. 5: 42, 46; Luke 6: 34
23[a]	Ap. i. 33. 5	Luke 1: 31, 32; Matt. 1: 20, 21
24	Ap. i. 38. 8	Matt. 27: 39, 40; cf. Mark 15: 29; Luke 23: 25
25[b]	Dial. 88. 8; 103. 6	Luke 3: 22; cf. Matt. 3: 17; Mark 1: 11
28[c]	Dial. 101. 3	Matt. 27: 42, 43; cf. Mark 15: 29, 30; Luke 23: 35
29	Dial. 103. 8	Luke 22: 44; cf. Matt. 26: 39
30[d]	Dial. 112. 4	Matt. 23: 27, 24

[a] Perhaps also dogmatic.

[b] This may also have dogmatic significance.

[c] Perhaps also dogmatic.

[d] Perhaps also stylistic.

CHAPTER IV

ETHICAL AND PRACTICAL VARIATION

Discussion of Ethical and Practical Variation

The heading probably needs clarification. The term "practical" is related to motivation that can scarcely be dignified by the adjective "dogmatic." It grows partly from the circumstance that the Christian leaders of the second century were faced with the perennial problems of moral living, and the necessity of providing appropriate and strong sanctions for right living, and partly from the necessities of argument. Although dogma occupied a large place in their lives and in their writings, it must be said that even the more philosophically inclined writers like Clement of Alexandria felt it to be a duty of no mean proportions to stress practical conduct. Even the smallest and to us most trivial concern of everyday life was not overlooked. And as long as Christianity remained an illegal religion in the Roman Empire the sanctions within the group required special power.

One such sanction was the sacred Scriptures, as they always are in this and every other religion as far as the masses of the people are concerned. "Thus saith the Lord" settles it for many an individual. Let Justin, for example, phrase the statement attributed to Jesus, "He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me," so as to read, "He who heareth me and doeth what I say, heareth Him that sent me." By the peculiar simplification of the sentence and especially by the addition of "and doeth what I say" the writer has produced a strong sanction for action on the part of Christians.[1]

Again, situations of an entirely different character may emerge giving rise to questionings which appeal to Scriptural authority will satisfy. It may be that an example of this is Justin's inclusion of the word ψευδοαπόστολοι in his quotation of

---

[1] Infra, p. 35.

Matthew 24: 11, 24.[1] He wanted to show that Jesus when on earth knew all about the advocates of "false doctrines" who would arise in the subsequent history of his people.

An excellent illustration of this type of motivation is found in Clement's writings.[2] It has to do with the omission of μίαν before τρίχα and makes the words of the Gospel apply against the practice of dyeing the hair. These illustrations are the expression of the needs of men living in the midst of pressing practical problems to which they must find solution. It would be strange indeed had they overlooked the tremendous authoritarian power of the Christian Scriptures.

This desire for sanction would at times result in the changing of the wording of the text, at times in interpretation of the text, in spiritualizing it, at still other times in the selection of one variant reading as over against another. The following statement of Jacquier applies to the practical as well as to other types of motivation:

> It is quite evident that the writers do not all have the same authority nor their quotations the same value. However, the quality of a text does not depend on the orthodoxy of him who quoted it, except for the case of the heretics who wilfully altered the texts. The value of a quotation depends more on the care which the writer took in quoting his text, and the manner in which he treated them, and the use he made of them. It sometimes happens that a writer chose one variant rather than another because it was better suited to his argument.[3]

Instances of Ethical and Practical Variation

Class A

Example 1

Ap. 1. 16. 10	Luke 10: 16; cf. Matt. 10: 40; 7: 24
Ὁ γὰρ ἀκούει μου καὶ ποιεῖ ἃ λέγω ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντος με.[1]	Ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ. ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

---

[1] Infra, pp. 36 f. [2] Infra, p. 42.

[3] E. Jacquier, Le Nouveau Testament dans l'Église chrétienne (Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1913), p. 299.

[4] Cyp. adds: et eum qui me misit; a, b add the same.

In 63. 5, Justin has ὁ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με. Bousset thinks that this would indicate that Justin had essentially this rendering as a source. He cites Pseudo-Ignatius 5 and Const. viii. 44 in favor of this; also codex D. But he does admit "der Zusatz in der ersten Anführung καὶ ποιεῖ ἃ λέγω stammt naturlich von J. selbst." But the words of Matthew 7: 24 are significant: Πάς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτούς. We see by this that Justin had authority for his rendering

That Justin should introduce this phrase here is not to be thought strange. The emphasis of his whole argument lies right in this: those who are Christians <u>in fact</u> do the sayings of Jesus as set forth in chapters 15 and 16. The remaining part of chapter 16 bears this out,

> "By their <u>works</u> ye shall know them. And every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire." And as to those who are not living pursuant to these His teachings, and are Christians only in name, we demand that all such be punished by you.

His aim here is practical, constituting real apologetic.

A glance at Tischendorf's critical apparatus will show that in the rest of the quotation Justin has plenty of companionship. This may mean, as Bousset suggests, a text showing this peculiarity, or it may signify an oral version that had widespread currency, or it may mean that one writer was indebted to another for his reading. It may well be that the reading arose from a situation like that Justin was in when he attempted to give an adequate summary of Jesus' teaching--concise, yet true to the spirit of the passages. Indeed, why not from Justin himself?

Example 2

<u>Dial. 35. 3</u>	<u>Matt. 24: 11, 24; cf. II Cor. 11: 13; Mark 13: 22; Matt. 7: 15</u>
Ἀναστήσονται πολλοὶ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοαπόστολοι καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν πιστῶν πλανήσουσιν.	Καὶ πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐγερθήσονται καὶ πλανήσουσιν πολλούς. ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι.

It may be debated whether Justin in his quotation really goes back to Matthew. But an examination of the passage has convinced me that this is quite possible. There is, however, the

strange circumstance that Justin seems to be getting at the thought of Jesus through his acquaintance with the apostle Paul. Jesus does not include ψευδαπόστολοι in his words which are distributed throughout the Gospels. But in II Cor. 11: 13 we read: οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι ψευδαπόστολοι ἐργάται δόλιοι, μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους. This takes on added significance when in the same chapter Justin quotes Jesus as saying Ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις. Now according to the Gospels Jesus said much to indicate the spirit of the words but never made this particular statement. But Paul in I Cor. 11: 18, 19 does make an approximate assertion: "I hear that there are schisms among you and I partly believe it; for there must be heresies among you." Purves says that this new saying attributed to Jesus

> looks like a substantial expression in Paul's language of Christ's warning against false prophets. So Justin shortly after adds to Christ's prediction that "many false prophets shall arise," the words, "and false apostles." Similar warnings, in various phraseology taken from later times, are attributed to Christ by several early writers.[1]

But a most significant point to notice is the context of the whole series of quotations in chapter 35. Justin's point is to show that Jesus knew beforehand what would take place after his death: that he knew "what would befall those who believed on and confessed Him, the Christ." The Marcians (Μαρκιανοί), the Valentinians, Basilidians, and Saturnilians--these are the "false apostles" of whom "Christ" spoke. In adding the phrase, "and false apostles shall arise," Justin was indeed true to the spirit of Jesus as represented in the Gospels, but the reading itself is not canonical. We must conclude that his use of it grew out of the necessity of his apologetic. And, incidentally, the same is true of the statement attributed to Jesus, "There shall be schisms and heresies." Jesus had said sufficient on the matter (according to the Gospels), and Paul had provided the necessary language.

Example 3

Ap. 1. 34. 1	Matt. 2: 6; cf. Mic. 5: 2
ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου.	ἐκ σοῦ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

---

[1]G. T. Purves, The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity (New York: A. D. F. Randolph and Company, 1889), p. 190.

Justin quotes this as the statement of Micah which indeed is its origin. But, in fact, Justin quotes Matthew's version of Micah 5: 2. This is our justification for including it here. It illustrates very clearly the point we are attempting to make. Purves feels the same way about it: "In quoting the words of Micah from Matthew, 'who shall rule my people,' he omits the closing words τὸν Ἰσραήλ, fearing no doubt, that they might be interpreted of the Jewish people."[1] This, of course, Justin could never allow. In the Dialogue with Trypho he goes out of his way to convince the Jew that the Christians are the true Israel:

> As from the one man Jacob, who was surnamed Israel, all your nation has been called Jacob and Israel; so we from Christ, who begat us unto God, like Jacob and Israel, and Judah, and Joseph, and David, are called and are the true sons of God, and keep the commandments of Christ.[2]

Again, he says:

> As Christ is the Israel and the Jacob, even so we, who have been quarried out from the bowels of Christ, are the true Israel.[3]

Example 4

Protr. 10	Matt. 5: 28
οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, ἐπιθυμία γὰρ μόνη μεμοίχευκας.	ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.[1]

This passage from Matthew's Gospel apparently lent itself to variation. Barnard feels that the reading of Stromata iii. 14 really represents that of Clement's text. It runs as follows: Πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν. This corresponds, in general, with the Gospel passage though there are some variations even here. The phrase ἐν τῇ καρδία αὐτοῦ is missing. It may not have been in his text or it is conceivable that his purpose did not call for its inclusion. It will be recalled that Justin felt it necessary to add the explanatory phrase παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. Clement simply omits all of it. The reason

---

[1] Ibid., p. 199.

[2] Justin Dialogue 123. 9.

[3] Ibid., 135.

[4] Δ, Thphil. omit αὐτὴν after ἐμοίχευσεν.

is that what he quotes is pertinent to his purpose. He is intent on equating ἐπιθυμία with the overt act of adultery. To intensify the instruction against ἐπιθυμία he puts his quotation in the form of a direct command six times. In the instance under consideration it stands with the revered commandments of the Old Testament itself.

The further instances in which Clement either quotes or alludes to this passage are Paedagogue iii. 11; iii. 5; ii. 6; Stromata iii. 14; iv. 18; iii. 2; ii. 11; ii. 15; vii. 13; ii. 14; iii. 2; iii. 4; iii. 11.

An illustration or two from these may be of interest. In Paedagogue iii. 11 he writes οὐ γὰρ ἁψαμένος μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ θεασαμένους ἔστιν ἁμαρτεῖν. A translation of the immediate context gives the following:

> But above all it seems right that we should turn away from the sight of women. For it is sin, not only to touch but to look; and he who is rightly trained must especially avoid them. "Let thine eyes look straight and thine eyelids wink right." For while it is possible for one who looks to remain steadfast; yet case must be taken against falling. For it is possible for one who looks to slip; but it is impossible for one who looks not, to lust.

Here, the reference to Matthew is merely an allusion. Yet the difference is clearly drawn between the overt act of adultery and the look resulting in desire. That Clement should state it thus is natural since his subject is "the Christian government of the eyes."

One other instance is worthy of note because it contains a curious addition. It is found in Paedagogue iii. 5: ὁ γὰρ ἐμβλέψας, φησὶ, περιεργότερον ἤδη ἥμαρτεν. The chapter treats of behavior in the baths, and the warning is against a lack of modesty between men and women:

> Men, therefore, affording to women a noble example of truth, ought to be ashamed of their stripping before them, and guard against dangerous sights; "for he who has looked curiously," it is said, "hath sinned already."

The introduction of περιεργότερον is instructive, in that it shows how readily a change was made to suit the context. The curiosity of certain people in the baths was the human, if ludicrous situation which produced the addition περιεργότερον.

---

[1] The Greek seems to carry the idea of one taking great pains to do a thing; it adds to the picture of the curious people given by Clement.

Example 5

Paed. i. 10	Matt. 8: 12; cf. 22: 13, 25: 30
καθὸ κἀκεῖνο εἴρηται· οἱ δὲ ἁμαρτίαις περιπεσόντες βληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια.	οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐξελεύσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

In his arrangement of material Barnard seems to associate the quotation primarily with Matthew 8: 12. The three contexts where it is found in Matthew differ greatly. In Matthew 8: 12 it appears in connection with the centurion's visit to Jesus. The Jews are the "sons of the kingdom" who are to be cast into outer darkness. In Matthew 22: 13 it appears at the end of the parable of the marriage-feast. There, the unprepared guest is to be cast into outer darkness. In Matthew 25: 30 it is related to the parable of the talents; the unprofitable servant is to be cast into outer darkness.

Clement disregards all of these settings. He substitutes a phrase which, for the Gospel writers would of course be true, but which does not appear in their compositions, namely, "they that fall into sins." He is showing, in this chapter, that the Word saves humanity from sin by threatening and by exhortation. There are three types of counsel, one which takes examples from the past, one from present times, and the third

> consists of what is future, by which we are bidden guard against what is to happen; as also that was said, "They that fall into sins shall be cast into outer darkness, where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

By doing this Clement makes the passage a forthright statement of warning to all Christians.

Example 6

Paed. ii. 2	Matt. 11: 19; cf. Luke 7: 34
ἦλθεν γὰρ, φησὶν, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ λέγουσιν· Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος.[1]	ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν· Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν.

[1] In Luke, 142* and a omit καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν.

The omission of ἁμαρτωλῶν strikes the eye at once. In the context the author is showing that Jesus did drink wine though with moderation. He cites several instances to prove his case, among which appears the above quotation. The part of the quotation pertinent to his argument is that which reads: "Behold a glutton and a wine-bibber." But he goes on to include "a friend of publicans." This inclusion would suggest that he had in mind the entire verse, but deliberately excluded the reference to sinners.

Now there probably was good reason for him to do so. For one thing its inclusion would have resulted in the weakening of his own position. He has very real convictions on the subject of with whom the Christians are to associate:

> The licentious rush readily into uncleanness, like swine rushing to that part of the hold of the ship which is depressed. Whence the Scripture most strenuously exhorts, "Introduce not everyone into thy house, for the snares of the crafty are many." And in another place, "Let just men be thy guests, and in the fear of the Lord let thy boast remain."[1]

How far removed from the spirit of this entire chapter is the reference to Jesus as the friend of sinners!

May it not be that there is here an evidence of the same motive which prompted the writer of the Fourth Gospel to omit the picture of Jesus as the friend of sinners?[2] "The Gospel account of Jesus' association with sinners," says Dean Colwell, "was as unattractive to men like Celsus as was the low social level of Christianity through the second century."[3]

In another place Clement cites this passage with an interesting variation: Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλός.[4] Barnard has pointed out that there seems to be no other evidence for the nominative ἁμαρτωλός.[5] No light, it seems, can be shed on it from this present point of view.

---

[1]Clement Paedagogue iii. 4.

[2]E. C. Colwell, John Defends the Gospel (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1936), pp. 50 ff.

[3]Ibid., p. 53.

[4]Clement Stromata iii. 6.

[5]P. M. Barnard, The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria (Cambridge: The University Press, 1899), p. 16.

Example 7

Paed. iii. 3	Matt. 5: 36
οὐδεὶς δὲ ἄλλος, φησὶν ὁ κύριος, δύναται ποιῆσαι τρίχα λευκὴν ἢ μέλαιναν.	μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὀμόσῃς, ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ποιῆσαι ἢ μέλαιναν.

Two factors are of interest here. The first is the substitution of οὐδεὶς δὲ ἄλλος for οὐ δύνασαι. The reason for the change is plain when we consider that Clement is saying that men have no right to change the color of their hair. That is the prerogative of God alone:

> Prophecy has called him (God), the "Ancient of days; and the hair of his head was as white as pure wool," says the prophet. "And none other," says the Lord, "can make the hair white or black." How, then, do these godless ones work in rivalry with God, or rather violently oppose Him, when they transmute the hair made white by Him?

The second feature to be noted is the omission by Clement of μίαν. The context of the Gospel usage is an injunction against swearing. The reference to the hair is purely figurative. But here, Clement makes it refer literally to changing the color of the hair. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to speak of making "one" hair white or black. The reference must be to the hair of the head as such. Hence, the omission of μίαν and the resulting general reference to the hair.

Example 8

Strom. i. 3	Matt. 8: 20; cf. Luke 9: 58
Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρωπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνει.	Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔκει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ.

Clement omits καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις. The omission is understandable. He is writing against the "Sophists," and in doing so quotes the Athenian Solon:

> Look to the tongue, and to the words of the glozing man,
> But you look on no work that has been done;
> But each one of you walks in the steps of a fox,
> And in all of you is an empty mind.

It is the appearance of the word "fox" in this quotation that prompts the New Testament quotation.[1] For he immediately says:

> This, I think, is significant by the utterance of the Savior, "The foxes have holes, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head". . . .

The reference to the birds lay outside the scope of his purpose.[2]

Example 9

Strom. i. 10	II Tim. 2: 22
Τὰς νεωτέρας ζητήσεις φεύγετε.	Τὰς δὲ νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας φεῦγε.

There can be little doubt that Clement is referring to II Timothy 2: 22 when he says that the apostle adds τὰς νεωτέρας ζητήσεις φεύγετε. But the changes are considerable. For νεωτερικὰς he has νεωτέρας; for ἐπιθυμίας he gives ζητήσεις, and for φεῦγε, φεύγετε.

Now it is entirely understandable that the writer of the epistle should be represented as sending sound advice to the young man Timothy to the effect that he should "flee youthful desires." But Clement's situation is different. In order to use the passage for his own purpose he has to make certain adjustments.

For one thing, the writer of the epistle is represented as writing to an individual. He accordingly uses the second person singular imperative, φεῦγε. But Clement has in mind the Christians generally. He, therefore, changes to the plural.

Again, the New Testament writer's use of ἐπιθυμίας (desire), while natural enough in its own setting, does not suit our writer's argument. He is talking about the Stoic philosophy which

---

[1] That the omission was intentional seems to be quite definitely established by what Clement has in the Stromata iv. 6: "'The foxes have holes.' He (the Lord), called those evil and earthly men who are occupied about the wealth which is mined and dug from the ground, foxes. Thus, also, in reference to Herod: 'Go, tell that fox, Behold I cast out devils, and perform cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I shall be perfected.' For He applied the name 'fowls of the air' to those who were distinct from the other birds--those really pure, those that have the power of flying to the knowledge of the heavenly Word."

[2] See note above.

the Christian is to shun. He therefore changes to ζητήσεις.

The other change from νεωτερικὰς to νεωτέρας, is more subtle. The former means "natural to youth." But νεωτέρας means "newer." Clement may be trying to warn his readers against embracing "new" movements of thought. Only superficially conceived was Christianity new. Actually it rooted in antiquity. Justin had taken great pains to point this out. Clement could affirm the same. Tollinton points out that

> the Church could claim antiquity as well as unity. The apostles after Christ, founded the Church, and suffered for it. The Church is the keeper of an unbroken continuity of tradition. The sequence of truth has been preserved by its members, and the true treasures of the spirit are to be found in the ancient Church alone. Here is a further contrast with the heresies. "The heresiarchs began quite late, about the time of Hadrian". The Church goes back to the date of the Lord Himself, and can claim the further antiquity of Prophets and Apostles and the divine eternal purpose. The ancient things are always venerable in Clement's eyes.[1]

To be sure the Word has said: "Seek and ye shall find." But this needs interpretation:

> But seeking ends in finding, driving out the empty, trifling, and approving of the contemplation which confirms our faith.

Example 10

Strom. ii. 19	Luke 6: 36
Γίνεσθε, φησὶν ὁ Κύριος, ἐλεήμονες καὶ οἰκτίρμονες ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.	Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.

Clement here adds ἐλεήμονες. How frequently this passage was changed may be seen by consulting Resch, Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu Lc.[2] Clement's reading takes its place in this maze of usages. In the Acts of Thomas we read, καὶ γίνεσθε ἀγαθοί,

---

[1] R. B. Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London: Williams and Norgate, 1914), II, 105 f.

[2] Alfred Resch, Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1895), Zweiter Theil, pp. 88, 91-93.

οἰκτίρμονες, ἐλεήμονες.[1] Justin also has the combination χρηστοὶ, καὶ οἰκτίρμονες.[2] The fact, however, that Clement has οἰκτίρμων alone without the repetition of ἐλεήμονες in the clause of comparison suggests that he knew the common reading. Why then did he add ἐλεήμονες?

It will be recalled that ἐλεήμονες comes from the same root as the word for alms, ἐλεημοσύνη. This throws light upon the reason for the addition. Clement is showing that the true Gnostic is like God especially in the matter of almsgiving. To this end he quotes Proverbs 21: 26: δίκαιοι δὲ οἰκτείρουσι καὶ ἐλεοῦσι, which contains the two elements of the New Testament passage.

And what he means by mercy (ἔλεος) is set forth in unmistakable clarity in Stromata iv. 6.

> He again says, "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy." And mercy is not, as some of the philosophers have imagined, pain on account of others' calamities, but rather something good, as the prophets say. For it is said, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice" [ἔλεον θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν]. And he means by the merciful, not only those who do acts of mercy, but those who wish to do them, though they be not able; who do as far as purpose is concerned. For sometimes we wish by the gift of money or by personal effort to do mercy, or to assist one in want, or help one who is sick or stand by one who is in emergency; and are not able either from poverty, or disease, or old age (for this also is natural disease), to carry out our purpose, in reference to the things to which we are impelled, being unable to conduct them to the end we wished.

This list of good deeds or good intentions, then, constitutes "mercy." It is another way of emphasizing the importance of almsgiving, for, says Clement, there are two paths by which the salvation of perfection may be reached, namely, "works and knowledge."[3] This whole background together with the needs of the immediate context called forth the inclusion of ἐλεήμονες.

---

[1] Ed. Bonnet, p. 56.

[2] Justin Dialogue 96; also Apology i. 15.

[3] Clement Stromata iv. 6.

Instances of Ethical and Practical Variation

Class B

Example 1

Strom. iv. 6	Luke 19: 10
Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐλθὼν σήμερον τὸ ἀπολωλὸς εὗρεν.	ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

Here, there is a change from a general to a specific statement of purpose. In Luke, the Son of Man came to save the lost in general. This generalization is attached to the preceding clause only by the insertion of γὰρ, and might be at home in any appropriate context. Clement, however, makes the reference specific. It applies definitely to the visit of Jesus with Zaccheus:

> Christ, who trains the soul, reckons one rich, not by his gifts but by his choice. It is said, therefore, that Zaccheus, or, according to some, Matthew, the chief of the publicans, on hearing that the Lord had deigned to come to him, said, "Lord, and if I have taken anything by false accusation, I restore him fourfold; on which the Savior said, "The Son of Man on coming [ἐλθὼν] today, has found [εὗρεν] that which was lost."

Example 2

Strom. iv. 26	Matt. 5: 16
λαμψάτω γὰρ σου τὰ ἔργα.	οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοις.

It is to be observed that Justin Martyr has λαμψάτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἵνα βλέποντες θαυμάζωσι τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. In view of the correspondence of this phrase with τὰ καλὰ ἔργα of Matthew 5: 16b, it would seem that Justin has brought this phrase forward. The clause, "Let your light shine before men," would raise the question as to what is meant by the "light." The answer was to be found in the same verse of Scripture, namely, "good works." Clement followed, consciously or otherwise, the lead of Justin,

and equates the "light" with "works." This he does twice in the Stromata.[1]

Clement, with his insistence on the necessity of alms in particular, and good works in general would find this interpretation of φῶς most useful. It was later used by Origen himself.[2]

The context of the present instance is enlightening:

> But we ought to have works that cry aloud, as becoming "those that walk in the day." "Let thy works shine," and behold a man and his works before his face. "For behold God and his works." For the Gnostic must, as far as it is possible, imitate God.

Example 3

Strom. vi. 8	Jude 22, 23
Καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεᾶτε.	Καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ. . . . .

Clement has brought διακρινομένους over from verse 22 into verse 23. The context shows why he emphasized διακρινομένους.

> And who shall understand a parable of the Lord, but the wise, the intelligent, and he that loves his Lord? Let such a man be faithful; let him be wise in the discrimination [διακρίσει] of words; let him be dexterous in action; let him be pure. "The greater he seems to be, the more humble should he be," says Clement in the Epistle to the Corinthians, "such an one as is capable of complying with the precept, 'And some pluck from the fire, and on others have compassion, making a difference'" [διακρινομένους].

It is this matter of discrimination that forms the whole point to the quotation, and determines the form used.[3]

Example 4

Q.D.S. 4	Mark 10: 22
Ὁ δὲ στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἀπῆλθε λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ	Ὁ δὲ στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ

---

[1]The other reference is iii. 4.

[2]Origen Exhortation to Martyrdom xviii. 6.

[3]Kutter, without discussing his specific idea in this connection, places the quotation in the category of intentional variation. See Hermann Kutter, Clemens Alexandrinus (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1897), p. 34.

ἔχων χρήματι πολλὰ καὶ ἀργούς. ἔχων κτήματα πολλά.

Barnard points out that D reads πολλά χρήματα and 116 χρήματα πολλά. Also that B and Chr. have χρήματα in Matthew 19: 22; b and d have multas pecunias, a multam pecuniam, ff^2 multas possessiones et pecunias. There seems to have been a growing tendency to distinguish between money and other property. Clement's addition of ἀργούς is a part of this tendency. There is no Greek evidence for the addition. But the growing distinction is reflected in the Latin manuscripts.

It may be noted how well the combination, χρήματα and ἀργούς, expresses this distinction since χρῆμα in the plural applies quite definitely to money. It is of interest to note that in Acts 4: 36, 37 we have the following combination, with χρῆμα used in the singular: Λευείτης κύπριος τῷ γένει ὑπάρχοντες αὐτῷ ἀγροῦ, πωλήσας ἤνεγκεν τὸ χρῆμα καὶ ἔθηκεν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων.

TABLE 3

ETHICAL AND PRACTICAL VARIATIONS

Thesis Page	Patristic Literature	New Testament
	Class A	
35	Ap. i. 16. 10	Luke 10: 16; cf. Matt. 10: 40; 7: 24
36[a]	Dial. 35. 3	Matt. 24: 11, 24; cf. II Cor. 11: 13; Mark 13: 22; Matt. 7: 15
37[b]	Ap. i. 34. 1	Matt. 2: 6
38	Protr. x. 77. 22 f	Matt. 5: 28
40	Paed. i. 10. 91 (151)	Matt. 8: 12; cf. 22: 28; 25: 30
40[c]	Paed. ii. 2. 32 (186)	Matt. 11: 19; cf. Luke 7: 34
42	Paed. iii. 3. 16 (262)	Matt. 5: 36
42	Strom. i. 3. 23 (329)	Matt. 8: 20; cf. Luke 9: 58
43[d]	Strom. i. 10. 51 (346)	II Tim. 2: 22
44	Strom. ii. 19. 100 (482)	Luke 6L36
	Class B	
46	Strom. iv. 6. 36 (579)	Luke 19: 10
46[e]	Strom. iv. 26. 171 (642)	Matt. 5: 16
47	Strom. ii. 8. 65 (773)	Jude 22, 23
47	Q.D.S. 4 (938)	Mark 10: 22

[a]Perhaps also dogmatic. [b]Perhaps also dogmatic.

[c]Perhaps also dogmatic. [d]Perhaps also stylistic.

[e]Perhaps also stylistic.

CHAPTER V

STYLISTIC VARIATION

Discussion of Stylistic Variation

In the Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen we have a classical example of what actually did take place.[1] Reference has already been made to this incident,[2] but the story has not been detailed. The account is of a certain Spyridon, bishop of Trimythun in Cyprus. The bishops of Cyprus had met to consult on a particular emergency. Sozomen and a bishop by the name of Triphyllius met with them. The latter seems to have been a particularly eloquent man. The account runs:

> When an assembly had convened, having been requested to address the people Triphyllius had occasion, in the middle of his discourse to quote the text, "Take up thy bed and walk," but he substituted the word σκίμπους, for the word κράββατος. Sozomen was indignant and exclaimed, "Art thou greater than he who uttered the word κράββατος that thou art ashamed to use his words?" When he had said this, he turned from the throne of the priest and looked towards the people; by this act he taught them to keep the man who is proud of eloquence within his bounds.

Holtzmann, speaking of intentional variations in the text of the New Testament, remarks that "a thinking copyist may in some circumstances be more dangerous than a thoughtless one." And Cone elaborates this as follows:

> There are "learned corrections" of a linguistic or grammatical nature and syntactical changes in the interest of what the copyist appears to have regarded as an improvement of the construction.[3]

Gregory finds three stages in the early development of the text, (1) the original text, (2) the re-wrought text which came into existence in the second century and is identified with the Western text of Westcott and Hort, and, (3) the polished text.

---

[1] Sozomen Ecclesiastical History xi.

[2] Supra, pp. 2 f.

[3] Orello Cone, Gospel Criticism and Historical Christianity (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1891), p. 13.

Of number three Gregory says that

> the moment Christian science existed, that moment it busied itself with the text of the New Testament. . . . . Whether at Alexandria, or at Antioch, or at Caesarea, when men who had an accurate training in grammar came to examine closely the text, they found many a trifle that did not agree with the rules then long recognized for the use of the Greek language. They were acquainted with the dangers of manuscript tradition, and had at least some vague conception of the comparatively unlearned character of early Christian communities. When, then, they found in the text of the books of the New Testament what seemed to them to be or actually were faults of one kind or another, two ways of accounting for these were open to them. It was possible to say that the writers of these books had been guided and protected from faults by the Holy Spirit, that the original form of their writings must have been in every respect all that could be desired, and if in the copies in hand there were found errors or faults, these must necessarily be attributed to the carelessness or ignorance of the Christians who had from time to time copied the rolls. There is, then, no need to say that Christian scholars, detecting these faults, corrected them without hesitation; and considered themselves not merely justified in so doing, but as forced by duty to do so. That was one view.
>
> It was possible also to say that these writers of the New Testament were most of them by no means so well at home in the Greek language as to be able to use it skilfully, to write it correctly. They were guided by the Spirit of God in the sense of their utterances. But this Spirit of God did not occupy itself with the external form of the language. In consequence, the sacred writers had written less elegantly and less correctly than was really to be desired in a book of so great moment. That had not been a serious detriment to the spread of Christianity during those early years of plain preaching. Now, however, that cultured men began to interest themselves for Christianity, now that the reading of these writings formed so important a part in the services of the churches, it was necessary that a skilful hand smooth away the linguistic roughnesses and make the text, if not good, at least better than it had been. We may be sure that the scholars of Alexandria and Antioch and Caesarea viewed the matter from one or the other of these two points of view.
>
> There does not seem to have been any concerted action in reference to the text. So far as our documents go, no one seems to have set about a regular revision of the whole New Testament, or even of one or more books. Whether these scholars did not venture to do the thing thoroughly, or whether they supposed that if they did but change a little here and there for the better it would never be noticed, or whether the rolls in which they made their complete correction of the text have failed to be handed down to us, we cannot with certainty determine. What we find in the documents and particularly in documents and in the writings of theologians connected with Egypt, is that in a number of passages, readings have been produced which have certainly been after-thoughts and not the original readings, and which betray the moulding hand of the trained scholar which has been

making the text more presentable to, more agreeable for learned and for educated eyes and ears.[1]

In this same connection Scrivener points out that an elegant Greek idiom may be transformed into simpler language. He gives as an example Acts 14: 3, ἤδεισαν γὰρ πάντες ὅτι Ἕλλην ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ὑπῆρχεν for ἤδεισαν γὰρ ἅπαντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτου ὅτι Ἕλλην ὑπῆρχεν. Also that a Hebraism may be softened by transcribers, as in Matthew 21: 23, ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ for ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ before προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ διδάσκοντι. And in Matthew 15: 5, and Mark 7: 15 where καὶ is dropped in some copies to facilitate the sense. "This perpetual correction of harsh, ungrammatical, or Oriental constructions characterizes the printed text of the Apocalypse and the recent MSS. on which it is founded." An example is Rev. 2: 20, τὴν γυναῖκα Ἰεζάβελ τὴν λέγουσαν for ἡ λέγουσα.[2]

It should be observed that certain of the examples which follow are not style in any grammatical sense, but only in the sense that they translate the words and concepts of a "barbarian" culture into Hellenistic idiom.[3]

Goguel speaks of the following as grammatically motivated glosses:[4]

II Cor. 8: 9
13: 2
I Tim. 6: 7
Philemon 12

Instances of Stylistic Variation

Class A

Example 1

Ap. i. 15. 16	Matt. 6: 21
ὅπου γὰρ ὁ θησαυρός ἐστιν ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.	ὅπου γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ θησαυρός σου, ἐκεῖ ἔσται καὶ ἡ καρδία σου.

---

[1]C. R. Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1907), pp. 492 f.

[2]F. H. A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament (4th ed.; London: George Bell & Sons, 1894), pp. 12 f.

[3]Infra, pp. 52, 55, 56, 58.

[4]Maurice Goguel, Le texte et les éditions du Nouveau Testament grec (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1920), p. 63.

The first observation to be made is that Clement of Alexandria also uses the word νοῦς in the place of καρδία but has a different word-order: ὅπου γὰρ ὁ νοῦς τινος ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ θησαυρός αὐτοῦ.[1] Furthermore Macarius has ὅπου ὁ νοῦς σου ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ θησαυρός.[2]

E. R. Goodenough has well indicated that the "great interest in Justin is his transitional position. In his writings are to be found for the first time in Christian literature many conceptions and phrases which later theologians used to great effect."[3] This being true we may be on the alert to note any influences on the subsequent development of the New Testament text which may be traceable to him. Sanday thinks that Clement of Alexandria probably derived his reading from Justin.[4]

To appreciate the term νοῦς in the writings of our author, one must be acquainted with his philosophical conceptions. Putting aside the temptation to an elaborate discussion of the matter in question it may simply be stated that for him the νοῦς was the very highest principle in man. He would, then, in the present context use the language which would adequately express his idea. Νοῦς itself was under bondage to θησαυρός--the very part of a man that was capable of apprehending God himself. It is doubtful if the term καρδία used very naturally in the Hebrew tradition would meet the needs of the philosophically inclined Justin Martyr.

Example 2

Paed. i. 2	Mark 2: 11
Ὁ σωτὴρ, ἀνάστα, φησὶ, τῷ παρειμένῳ, τὸν σκίμποδα ἐφ' ὃν κατάκεισαι λαβὼν ἄπιθι οἴκαδε.	Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε ἆρον τὸν κράβαττον σου καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.

---

[1] Clement Stromata vii. 12; also an approximate rendering in Q.D.S. 16.

[2] Macarius Homilies 16.

[3] E. R. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr (Jena: Verlag Frommannache Buchhandlung, 1923), Preface.

[4] W. A. Sanday, The Gospels in the Second Century (London: The Macmillan Company, 1876), p. 134.

It will be observed that Clement uses the word σκίμπους in place of the more vulgar κράββατος.[1] It is likely that to a man of the schools the more elegant word would be the more acceptable and familiar.

Example 3

Paed. i. 8	Matt. 5: 45
Ὁ πατήρ μου, φησὶν, ἐπιλάμπει τὸν ἥλιον τὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάντας.	ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς.

The change which concerns us here is that from ἀνατέλλει to ἐπιλάμπει. Clement makes the substitution to some form of the verb five times, but Protrepticus 11 shows that he knew the "true" reading. The context of this section shows that there ἀνατέλλει was to be preferred:

> Night fears the light and hiding itself in terror, gives place to the day of the Lord. Sleepless light is now over all, and the west has given credence to the east. For "the Sun of Righteousness," who drives his chariot over all, pervades equally all humanity, like "His Father, who makes His sun to rise [ἀνατέλλει] on all men. . . . . He hath changed sunset into sunrise.

Here, the whole point is the figure of the rising sun, making ἀνατέλλει most appropriate.

But why the change in the other five places? The quotation is used in one place to show that God is good.[3] The quotation, he says, proclaims "His (Jesus') Father to be good, and to be the Creator." It would seem from this that the idea of the goodness of God was connoted more by ἐπιλάμπει than by ἀνατέλλει as indeed the English equivalent would for us.

There is another reference which shows how the shining of the sun was related in the writer's mind with God's goodness:

> God is good on his own account . . . . . And the nature of that love was the source of righteousness--the cause, too, of his lighting up [ἐπιλάμποντος] His sun, and sending down His own Son.[4]

---

[1] Supra, p. 50.

[2] Note that for πορνοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς he has πάντας.

[3] Clement Paedagogue i. 8.

[4] Ibid., i. 9.

The passages in the Stromata are somewhat similar in usage, though there it is the Gnostic who should imitate God in his goodness who "makes His sun to shine on the just and on the unjust."[1]

This argument seems closely related to motivation of the stylistic variety. Ἐπιλάμπει may have seemed a more appropriate term to apply to the shining of the sun.[2]

Example 4

Paed. i. 11	John 10: 11
Ὁ γὰρ ἀγαθὸς ποιμὴν τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων.	Ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων.

Barnard points out that Clement has ἀγαθὸς six times, the right reading καλὸς only once. It seems evident why Clement preferred ἀγαθὸς to καλὸς since καλὸς connotes the idea of the beautiful and only secondarily that of moral goodness. He does, however, use καλὸς in the sense of "beautiful." Moreover, he insists that

> the Lord Himself was uncomely in aspect. . . . . And we saw Him, and He had no form nor comeliness [κάλλος], but his form was mean, inferior to men.[3]

Example 5

Paed. ii. 8	Matt. 15: 8; cf. Mark 7: 6
Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσι φιλοῦσι με ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πορρωτέρω ἐστὶν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.	Ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσιν με τιμᾷ ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

The change from τιμᾷ to φιλοῦσι may have some bearing on our subject. Clement quotes or alludes to the passage six times.

---

[1]Clement Stromata vii. 14.

[2]There is, however, the further possibility that the Logos symbolism is involved here. The philosophical emphasis of the context with its reference to Plato's teaching and to the Logos lends support to this position.

[3]Clement Paedagogue ii. 1.

[4]In Mark, D, a, b, c have αγαπα for τιμα; ethiopic: honorant me et amant me. Origen 3. 492: εγγιζει μοι ο λαος ουτος εν τω στοματι αυτων.

Three times he uses some form of the verb τιμάω and twice ἀγαπῶν.[1] The two words have, of course, two different connotations. Τιμάω means "to honor, or reverence," φιλέω means "to love." From this meaning of φιλέω there have been derived several special meanings, one of which was "to show signs of love, especially to kiss." Indeed, the word for "kiss," φίλημα, comes from the same root.

Note the context:

> He (Judas) was a hypocrite, giving a treacherous kiss [φίλημα], in imitation of another hypocrite of old. And he reproves that people respecting whom it was said, "This people honor [φιλοῦσι] me with their lips, but their heart is far from me."

It is with reference to this traitorous kiss, ostensibly a kiss of love, that he chooses the appropriate term φιλοῦσι.

The same principle of appropriateness holds in the case of the use of ἀγαπῶν. In the Stromata he is writing on love and naturally quotes I Corinthians 13: 3. He then adds: "For there is the people that loveth [ἀγαπῶν] with the lips."[2] From a context of this character it is easy to see how the principle word in it would be transferred to the quotation.[3]

Example 6

Strom. v. 11	Matt. 5: 6
Μακάριοι τῷ ὄντι κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὅτι πλησθήσονται τροφῆς ἀϊδίου.	Μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται.

---

[1]For τιμαω see Clement Stromata ii. 14; iv. 6; Clement Paedagogue i. 9. For αγαπων see Clement Stromata iv. 7; iv. 18.

[2]Clement Stromata iv. 18.

[3]Cf. P. M. Barnard, The Biblical Test of Clement of Alexandria (Cambridge, 1899), p. 31: "For the usual με τιμα we have τιμωσι με (143), φιλουσι με (206); and αγαπα με, the reading of D a b c in Mc, is distinctly recognized in (583, 614). The agreement with M in καρδια αυτου (577) is probably accidental. For απεχει of which Clement shows no knowledge, he has εστιν (206, 461, 143), the reading of D and the Latin in Mt. and of several Latin MSS. in Mc; and also απεστιν (577) the reading of L, some vulgate MSS., and Clement of Rome in Mc." The bracketed numbers are those of the Migne series, also referred to by Stählin.

The substitution by Clement of τὴν ἀλήθειαν for τὴν δικαιοσύνην first attracts the attention. This is the only place where he does this. Elsewhere he substitutes the phrase τὴν δικαιοσύνην τοῦ θεοῦ.[1] This latter phrase may have come in from his acquaintance with Paul's language in the letter to the Romans.

Light is shed on the substitution of ἀλήθειαν by reference to the context. He is showing that the true knowledge of God is obtained by abstraction from the body and its passions. In his argument he calls in as his witnesses Socrates, Callimachus, Bacchylides, Euripides, Plato, and Zeno. Obviously ἀλήθεια would be more at home in this context than δικαιοσύνη. Moreover, Clement identified truth and righteousness, and would grant that the Greeks possessed a fragment of the truth, fully realized in the Christian religion.[2]

How well the substitution, together with the addition of τροφῆς ἀϊδίου fits the context may be observed:

> Do you see how the Greeks deify the gnostic life (though not knowing how to become acquainted with it)? And what knowledge it it they know not even in a dream. If, then, it is agreed among us that knowledge is the food of reason [λογικὸν], "blessed truly are they," according to the Scriptures, "who hunger and thirst after truth: for they shall be filled" with everlasting food.

This seems to be an instance where our author adjusts language to meet the practical need of familiarity of expression in writing to a Greek-speaking community.

The second substitution, that of πλησθήσονται for χορτασθήσονται is of considerable significance.
"is a very strong and graphic word, originally applied to the feeding and fattening of animals in a stall. In Revelation 19: 21 it is used of the filling of the birds with the flesh of God's enemies. Also of the multitudes fed with the loaves and fishes."[3]

It will be observed, then, that the word had a crudely physical reference. This was not the case with πλησθήσονται. Luke uses the latter in the poetic words of the Magnificat.[4] But

---

[1]Clement Eclogae 14; Q.D.S. 17.

[2]Clement Protrepticus 8, 11.

[3]M. R. Vincent, Word Studies (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1890), I, 38.

[4]Luke 1: 53.

in speaking of the feeding of the multitude he finds χορτασθήσονται more satisfactory.[1]

When, therefore, Clement needs a word to express the satisfaction of spiritual hunger he chooses πλησθήσονται.

Example 7

Strom. vii. 12	Matt. 6: 21; cf. Luke 12: 34
Ὅπου γὰρ ὁ νοῦς τινός, φησὶν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ θησαυρὸς αὐτοῦ.	Ὅπου γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θησαυρός σου, ἐκεῖ ἔσται καὶ ἡ καρδία σου.

It has been pointed out that Justin Martyr makes the same substitution as is indicated above. For our discussion of Justin's change we pointed out that νοῦς would be much more at home in the non-Jewish environment than would the typically Jewish expression καρδία. This same principle holds true with Clement as with Justin.

Example 8

Q.D.S. 4	Mark 10: 25
εὐκόλως διὰ τῆς τρυμαλιᾶς τῆς βελόνης κάμηλος εἰσελεύσεται ἢ πλούσιος εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.	εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τῆς τρυμαλιᾶς τῆς ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

Barnard makes the suggestion that εὐκόλως (contentedly) must be a mistake for εὐκοπώτερόν, the true reading in all three Gospels.[2] It may be observed, however, that Clement never uses εὐκοπώτερόν . He has εὐκόλως once, ῥᾷον once, and θᾶττον twice.[3] One is not able to say if this was a conscious repudiation of εὐκοπώτερόν. Ῥᾷον and θᾶττον would be easy sense variants. But the same cannot be said of εὐκόλως. Here, Barnard's explanation may be sufficient.

In the case of the substitution of βελόνης for ῥαφίδος,

---

[1] Luke 9: 17.

[2] Barnard, op. cit., p. 33.

[3] Clement Q.D.S. 2, 4, 26; Strom. ii. 5.

however there seems to be a stylistic motivation present.[1] It is the judgment of grammarians that the latter is a vulgar expression. Vincent has pointed out that one of them, Phrynichus, said, "As for ῥαφίς, nobody would know what it is."[2]

It is of interest to note that Luke uses βελόνης,[3] although Matthew has ῥαφίς.[4] But Clement states definitely that he is quoting Mark: ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται. This would seem to indicate that he chose the more classical expression by preference.

Instances of Stylistic Variation

Class B

Example 1

Paed. iii. 4	Ephesians 5: 5
εὖ γὰρ τοῦτο ἴστε, ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.	τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες, ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὅ ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.

Kutter attributes the change from τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες to εὖ γὰρ τοῦτο ἴστε to carelessness.[5] This explanation is not entirely satisfactory. I am inclined to think that the change may have been for stylistic reasons. He preferred the simple combination εὖ with the form of the verb ἴστε.[6] He in this way avoided the intensive use of the participle ἴστε γινώσκοντες. This variation, it may be noted, is the only one occurring in the entire quotation. Moreover, Clement is usually accurate when quoting Ephesians. For that reason the change stands out much more conspicuously.

---

[1]Barnard, op. cit. Barnard points out that "της βελονης is read in Mc. by 13-69."

[2]Vincent, op. cit., p. 212.

[3]Luke 18: 25. [4]Matt. 19: 24.

[5]Hermann Kutter, Clemens Alexandrinus (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1897), p. 34.

[6]Εστε for ιστε with D, E, K, L, Thdrt. Dam. Thphyl. syr.^{sch}.

Example 2

Strom. i. 8	Matt. 5: 13
Ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ ἅλες τῆς γῆς.	Ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς.

The use by Clement of οἱ ἅλες in place of the familiar τὸ ἅλας involves a somewhat subtle distinction. οἱ ἅλες is the nominative plural of ὁ ἅλς meaning "a grain or lump of salt." But, in the plural it means "salt as prepared for use."[1] τὸ ἅλας, on the other hand, involves no such distinction. Barnard makes the suggestion that the reading οἱ ἅλες may have arisen from a confusion between the neuter singular ἅλας and the accusative plural of ἅλς.[2] I do not believe this to have been the case. I think that the context in which the quotation appears, together with the meaning of ἅλς in the plural will give the reason for the variant.

Clement uses ἅλς elsewhere than when quoting Scripture. When he does so it is in connection with the serving of food or in connection with the rites of the Mysteries. Note, for instance, its use in the Stromata where Clement is discussing the restraint shown by the true Gnostic:

> For pleasure is neither a function, nor a state, nor any part of us; but has been introduced into life as an auxiliary, as they say salt τοὺς ἅλας was to season food.[3]

And in connection with the expiatory rites of religious cults he writes:

> The same people, who worship every stick and greasy stone, as the saying is, dread tufts of tawny wool, and lumps of salt [ἁλῶν] . . . . in certain impure rites of expiation.[4]

Elsewhere, he discusses the orgies of certain of the mysteries:

> There is then the foam-born and Cyprus-born, the darling of Cinyras,--I mean Aphrodite, lover of the virilia, because sprung from them, even from those of Uranus, that were cut off,--those lustful members, that, after being cut off, offered violence to the waves. Of members so

---

[1] Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon (Abridged ed.; American Book Company, 1871), s. v.

[2] Barnard, op. cit., p. 5.

[3] Clement Stromata ii. 20. [4] Ibid., vii. 4.

> lewd--Aphrodite--is born. In the rites which celebrate this enjoyment of the sea, as a symbol of her birth a lump of salt [ἁλῶν] and the phallus are handed to those who are invited into the art of uncleanness.[1]

Finally, in the particular instance under consideration he is saying that the sophistry of the Greeks is a useless art. As a consequence, the words of Scripture, "Ye are the salt [ἅλες] of the earth," are not applied to all:

> For there are some even of the hearers of the word who are like the fishes of the sea, which, reared from their birth in brine, yet need salt [ἁλῶν] to dress them for food.

In each case cited, the plural form of the word is used. The use of this prepared salt as distinct from rock salt must have had an important function in common use and in certain mystic rites. Probably the two words, ἅλς and ἅλας had very distinct connotations. The word used by Clement was most appropriate to apply to Christians. This is especially true in our context where he is showing that many people have not yet broken away from their useless practices. The real connection is made in the simile of the fish, which, "reared from their birth in brine, yet need salt to dress them for food." The word used here is most appropriately ἅλς, and is in the plural. The implication is that the Christians can provide the "salt" that is lacking. Hence ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ ἅλες τῆς γῆς.

Example 3

Strom. iv. 6	Matt. 5: 8
Μακαρίους εἶπεν τοὺς καθαροὺς τὴν καρδίαν, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται.	Μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται.

Clement reads the dative, τῇ καρδίᾳ, eight times and the accusative, τὴν καρδίαν, five times. Barnard points out that the accusative may have resulted from a confusion between ι adscript and ν. But Robinson calls attention to the fact that the accusative was gradually ousting the dative wherever it could: "Datives disappear more and more, till in the modern language they are entirely lost."[2] But even if this be true, it is still a question

---

[1]Clement Protrepticus 2. [2]Barnard, op. cit., p. 4.

whether conscious motivation was present in this change. In a period of such transition in language it would be natural to move from one to the other of the alternatives.

TABLE 4

STYLISTIC VARIATIONS

Thesis Page	Patristic Literature	New Testament
	Class A	
52	Ap. i. 15. 16	Matt. 6: 21
53	Paed. i. 2. 4 (101)	Mark 2: 11
54	Paed. i. 8. 72 (141)	Matt. 5: 45
55	Paed. i. 11. 97 (156)	John 10: 11
55	Paed. ii. 8. 62 (206)	Matt. 15: 8; cf. Mark 7: 6
56	Strom. v. 11. 70 (688)	Matt. 6: 6
58	Strom. vii. 12. 77 (878)	Matt. 6: 21; cf. Luke 12: 34
58	Q.D.S. 4 (938)	Mark 10: 25
	Class B	
59	Paed. iii. 4. 29 (270)	Eph. 5: 5
60*	Strom. i. 8. 41 (340)	Matt. 5: 13
61	Strom. iv. 6. 39 (581)	Matt. 5: 8

*Perhaps also dogmatic.

CHAPTER VI

EXPLANATORY VARIATION

Discussion of Explanatory Variation

Goguel calls this category "particularly important." The variants, he points out,

> result from the fact that those who copied the New Testament and those for whom it was copied agreed in the conviction that the books which composed it were the perfect expression of the Truth. As a result, the New Testament could not contain any error in the true sense of the word, nor any real obscurity. Wherever these appeared, their elimination was a duty.[1]

He then gives a list of explanatory glosses which he has observed:

Mark 1: 34
Matthew 7: 21
Matthew 9: 13
Matthew 6: 25
Matthew 10: 23
Romans 8: 1, 4
I Corinthians 11: 29

Instances of Explanatory Variation

Class A

Example 1

Ap. i. 15. 1	Matt. 5: 28
Ὃς ἂν ἐμβλέψῃ γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτης ἤδη ἐμοίχευσε τῇ καρδίᾳ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.	Πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

The variant of concern to us here is the addition παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. Matthew represents Jesus as being vitally interested in the inner motives of people. The desire is the same whether or not one engages in the actual act of adultery and constitutes sin.

---

[1] Maurice Goguel, Le texte et les éditions du Nouveau Testament grec (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1920), p. 62.

Matthew does not refer it to God's judgment, at least not explicitly. But Justin's interest is not in this as a psychological fact merely; the truth is, the motives as well as the acts of men are open before God. Note his words in this connection:

> For not only he who in act commits adultery is rejected by Him (Christ), but also he who desires to commit adultery; since not only our works but our thoughts are open before God.[1]

For Justin, then, the addition of παρὰ τῷ θεῷ is a clarification of the thought of the passage.[2] How does one by desire alone commit adultery? The answer is that in the sight of God there is no distinction between the desire alone and the desire resulting in the overt act of adultery. Hence the addition παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. The same is to be said of a phrase which occurs a little further on in the same chapter having also to do with the matter of adultery. Ἀφ' ἑτέρου ἀνδρός is added to ὃς γαμεῖ ἀπολελυμένην. Obviously, the cause of this is an attempt to clarify the meaning of the passage.

Example 2

Paed. ii. 10	Luke 12: 31; cf. Matt. 6: 33
Ζητεῖτε γὰρ, φησὶ, τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τὰ τῆς προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.	Πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα προστεθήσεται ὑμιν.

In his comment on this and other instances where the above Scripture is used, Barnard says:

> Clement either confused Mt. and Lk. in his quotations of these verses, or else he used a codex into the text of which harmonistic alterations had been largely introduced, as they have been in many authorities still preserved to us.[4]

But there are elements of disagreement from both Matthew and Luke,

---

[1] Justin Apology i. 15.

[2] Purves comes to this same conclusion in The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity (New York: A. D. F. Randolph and Company, 1899), p. 197.

[3] Epiphanius in ελεγχ. λϛ: διο προστιθησι παντα τα ενταυθα οντα αυτου. ς and its witnesses add παντα.

[4] P. M. Barnard, The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria (Cambridge: The University Press, 1899), p. 46.

so that the notion of conscious harmonistic alteration is unnecessary. It would appear that what we find here is an example of the way in which various readings of this passage came into existence. In order to show this, several uses of it as found in our author's writings will be considered. We begin with the one recorded above.

The particular variant to be discussed is the substitution by Clement of τὰ τῆς τροφῆς for ταῦτα in Luke and ταῦτα πάντα in Matthew. The context will show quite plainly that this is for the purpose of lucidity. The writer has just been discussing the superfluity of luxury:

> And if we are naturally given to seeking, let us not destroy the faculty of seeking by directing it to luxury, but let us excite it to the discovery of truth. For He says, "Seek ye the kingdom of God, and the materials of sustenance shall be added to you."

Not luxuries but necessities are the things which will be added.

The same principle applies in the Stromata: ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ταῦτα γὰρ μεγάλα, τὰ δὲ μικρὰ καὶ περὶ τὸν βίον ταῦτα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.[1] It is, of course, difficult to place the parenthesis. In any case the explanatory material is substituted for ταῦτα or ταῦτα πάντα in Clement's argument. Some explanation seemed called for with reference to "these things" or "all these things."

Example 3

Strom. i. 1	Matt. 5: 15; cf. Mark 4: 21, 22; Luke 8: 16; 11: 33
Οὐδεὶς ἅπτει λύχνον καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τίθησιν ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς λυχνίας φαίνειν τοῖς τῆς ἑστιάσεως τῆς αὐτῆς κατηξιωμένοις.	Οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

The variant here is of considerable interest. It seeks to explain the meaning of the New Testament phrase, "those who are in the house." Clement's phrase, "to those who are considered worthy of the feast," may refer to the Eucharist or even to the Agape. It seems more probable, however, that Clement had in mind all of life as a festival, that is to say, the life of the Gnostic. His own words are: ἅπας δὲ ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ πανήγυρις ἁγία:

---

[1] Clement Stromata iv. 6.

"All his life is a holy festival."[1] If so the substitution grows out of the Gnostic experience of communion with God.[2]

Example 4

Strom. iv. 6	Matt. 5: 3; cf. Luke 6: 20
Μακάριοι δὲ καὶ οἱ πτωχοὶ εἴτε πνεύματι εἴτε περιουσίᾳ διὰ δικαιοσύνην δηλονότι.	Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

The use that Clement makes of this saying of Jesus is most interesting and instructive. It illustrates the sort of thing that the early Christians felt impelled to do with the passage. Since not all of the Christians were poor, it created a problem for those who had a measure of worldly goods. The context of the above reference from the Stromata is interesting:

> "And blessed are the poor," whether "in spirit" or in circumstances--that is, if for righteousness' sake. It is not the poor, simply, but those who have become poor for righteousness' sake, that he pronounces blessed--those who have despised the honours of this world in order to attain "the good."

It is also interesting to note that Clement substitutes διὰ δικαιοσύνην δηλονότι for ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. The substitution provides him with a powerful argument. Poverty itself is not a blessing, but the righteous life which poverty itself may help to achieve. He cannot quite get away from the fact that the statement applied originally literally to the poor. He, therefore, attempts to find in it a deeper meaning.

He recognizes that Matthew has added the phrase "in spirit" as an explanation. He points out that there is both good and evil wealth. The one we should seek to win, the other fling away. This is why Matthew added "in spirit" to "blessed are the poor": Διὸ καὶ προσέθηκεν ὁ Ματθαῖος· Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί· πῶς; τῷ πνεύματι.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., vii. 7.

[2] F. J. A. Hort and J. B. Mayor, Clement of Alexandria (London: Macmillan and Co., 1902), Index on prayer, p. 453.

[3] Q.D.S. 17. On Luke, Cyr. has εν μεν γαρ τω κατα Ματθαιον μακαριους εσεσθαι φησι τους πτωχ. τω πνευματι εν δε γε τοις προκειμενοις ημιν αναγνωσμασι μακαριους εσεσθαι φησι τους

It is clear from this that he deliberately chose the reading of Matthew in preference to that of Luke. This choice together with the argument which he employs throws light on how a variant like that of Matthew came into being. The social situation demanded an interpretation of the Lukan passage. Clement here provides a demonstration of the kind of process that went on. He had rich people to deal with; people who took seriously the words of Jesus respecting riches. His conclusion was that salvation

> does not lie in our external circumstances, neither in our wealth nor in our poverty, neither in the world's praise nor in the world's neglect . . . . . The qualities that determine life or death lie in the soul, nor should the reason of our final destiny be sought in any other quarter than the soul's inward state and disposition. There is a genuine and spurious poverty. Both depend on interior qualities.[1]

TABLE 5

EXPLANATORY VARIATIONS

Thesis Page	Patristic Literature	New Testament
63	Ap. i. 15. 1	Matt. 5: 28
64	Paed. ii. 10. 103 (232)	Luke 12: 31; cf. Matt. 6: 33
65*	Strom. i. 1. 12 (323)	Matt. 5: 15; cf. Mark 4: 21, 22; Luke 8: 16; 11: 33
66	Strom. iv. 6. 26 (575)	Matt. 5: 3; cf. Luke 6: 20

*Perhaps also dogmatic.

πτωχ. ου προσκειμενου τω πνευματι. Q, X, 1, 13, 33, 69, a, c, f, s, x, cop., syr.^{hr} add τω πνευματι.

[1]Cited in R. B. Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London: Williams and Norgate, 1914), I, 313.

CHAPTER VII

DOGMATIC VARIATION

Discussion of Dogmatic Variation

This is probably the most significant of all the various categories, accounting for the greatest number of non-accidental variations. This is not at all strange when we consider the part played by dogma in the early church. Harnack has made clear how closely it was related to the history of the text in the early centuries:

> When the New Testament was created the Church already had a doctrine; indeed this doctrine itself helped to create the New Testament. Doctrinal teaching could not be, nor ought to have been, rendered superfluous and thrust aside by the new written work; and it continued to be carried on in the Church. But all doctrine, however supernatural it may be in its foundations, depends for its exposition upon reason, and with the help of reason necessarily aims at simple and clear expression. As soon, however, as a sacred document comes into existence, doctrine begins to depend less and less on reason for its development; for each rational element can now be replaced by an authoritative element. The consequence is that both rational and authoritative elements are intermingled in the development of doctrine, that everyone becomes accustomed to such intermingling, and that the sense and desire for clear and logical thinking gradually becomes dulled. All this is exemplified to full extent in the history of the development of Dogma in the Church. We may observe it already in Irenaeus, in Tertullian with special clearness and in Origen. They operate with ratio and with autoritas, i.e. with proofs from Scripture, and interchange the two elements at will. A text from the New Testament is for them as good a proof as a logical argument. If the dogmatist was at a loss for an argument, a passage of Scripture came to his help; if doubts arose in his mind, they were repressed by a word of Scripture; if a proof could not be found, it was supplied by a verse of Scripture; if discrepancies were met with, these need only be so in appearance, for Scripture contains no discrepancies, and yet Scripture is absolutely consistent.[1]

Harnack proceeds to show that this condition greatly affected dogmatics. But the reverse must also have been true. If

---

[1]Adolf von Harnack, The Origin of the New Testament, trans. J. R. Williams (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925), pp. 158-60.

dogma and the text were so closely related it is unthinkable that the latter would not become to some extent contaminated.

This influence which dogma exerted on the early text has received some attention from textual critics. We shall note several instances of this recognition. Rendel Harris is one of those who champion the position advanced here. His position is indicated by the following statement:

> We have learnt from our study of the growth of the Western text of the Acts to distrust entirely the assumption that there are no such things as heretical and factional depravations of the text. As far as we are able to judge, one half of the Roman world Montanized its Acts of the Apostles, and the readings thus produced are found from the banks of the Tyne to beyond the Cataracts of the Nile. Hence we find it hard to believe that Dr. Hort can be right when he says that it is his distinct belief "that even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes." The statement seems too strong; and while we are willing to admit that the transcription of the New Testament in its successive stages has been accomplished, in the main, with excellent intentions, there are certain places where a foreign and factional hand can be detected.[1]

This tendency to alter Scripture for dogmatic purposes, however, was not confined to heretical or factional groups. Or perhaps we might ask what constituted orthodoxy in this early period? And even if we confine ourselves to a consideration of the methods of those writers who later were accepted by the dominant and successful group within the Christian movement we discover that they were doing the same thing as their opponents. It would be surprising were this not the case.

Gregory confirms what this study has suggested, namely, that Justin combines various passages that fit together into the thought and expression of his argument:

> Sometimes he warps the words to suit his point. And ever and ever again, by the sovereign right of a writer to give the sense without regard to words, he quotes the Greek Old Testament in such a way that if it were the text of the Gospels many an investigator would be inclined to call it a quotation from an unknown Gospel. If that be the way in which Justin cites the Scriptures of the Old Testament, we may in advance feel sure that he will not in the least act differently when he refers to the words of the New Testament.[2]

---

[1] J. R. Harris, Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-called Western Text of the New Testament (Cambridge: The University Press, 1891), p. 228.

[2] C. R. Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1907), pp. 88 f.

Scrivener, on the basis of Irenaeus' statement which prefers the reading 666 to 616 in the Apocalypse, concludes that we discern here the living interest which the contents of the Apocalypse had for the Christians of the second century "even up to the traditional preservation of its minutest reading."[1]

This critic, however, fails to recognize that Irenaeus had worked out an elaborate numerical scheme based on the number 666, his preferred reading. His prime motivation may possibly be traced back to this rather than to a critical desire to adhere to the reading of what he calls the "most approved and ancient manuscripts."[2]

Furthermore, Scrivener himself immediately has to recognize that the early Fathers were not always as critical as Irenaeus might lead us to conclude. He notices that Clement of Alexandria complains of those who tamper with or metaphrase the Gospels for their own ends. And he is compelled to agree with the observation of Tregelles that while Clement condemns others for doing this, he himself ventures on liberties no less extravagant when he quotes Matthew 19: 24: πειστέρον οὖν μᾶλλον τῇ γραφῇ λεγούσῃ, θᾶττον κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος βελόνης διελεύσεσθαι, ἢ πλούσιον φιλοσοφεῖν.

Kirsopp Lake, in an inaugural lecture delivered before the University of Leiden, took as his subject, "The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament."[3] He made a strong case in this treatise for conjectural emendation in the field of New Testament criticism. He arrived at this position in the following manner.

Westcott and Hort destroyed faith in the value of the Textus Receptus. They, themselves, failed to give us the true text, but did "show us how to reduce to order the unwieldy mass of Greek MSS., and sketched the true use and value of the evidence of Versions and Fathers."

This enabled their successors properly to evaluate discoveries like that of Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson in the MS of the

---

[1]F. H. A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, ed. Edward Miller (4th ed.; London: George Bell & Sons, 1894), II, 261 f.

[2]Irenaeus Against Heresies v. 20.

[3]Kirsopp Lake, The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament (Oxford: Parker and Son, 1904).

Old Syriac version; also Professor Blass' use of Patristic quotations.

> These discoveries and additions have paved the way for a general acceptance of the belief that we must abandon the method of basing the text primarily on the Greek MSS., and of regarding the Versions and Patristic quotations as possessing only secondary value.
>
> It has become more and more probable that Greek MSS. as a whole[1] only represent one type of text and its corruptions, that of the Latin Versions and Fathers represent another type, and the Syriac versions a third, while perhaps Clement of Alexandria may provide a fourth.
>
> It is between these texts, and not between individual MSS., that we shall have in the last resort to judge, so that the situation which we must face is that we have to deal with a number of local texts, that no two localities used quite the same text, that no locality has yet been shown to have used a text demonstrably better than its rivals, and that no one of these local texts is represented in an uncorrupt form by any single MS.

The result is, says Lake, that the textual critic may no longer think that he can edit the original text. He must first edit the local texts. In each of these localities he has

> the evidence of the versions used in the local church and of the writers who used them, but it is not very large and in no case is without traces of corruption. Therefore the student of these local texts is reduced to the level of the critics of classical texts. In the face of suspected corruption he has the right to use conjectural emendation.

The next step will be the attempt to reconstruct the text which lies behind all the local texts.

> It is too early to attempt to say much about the character which this text will assume: but personally I believe that we shall find that some corruptions have attached themselves to all local texts, or to almost all, and that it will therefore be impossible to reconstruct the underlying text by any mechanical method. Especially is this likely to be the case with doctrinal corruptions.

Lake exemplifies this by a "remarkable discovery" of Conybeare: Eusebius quotes Matthew 28: 19 at least eighteen times in the form, "Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all nations in my name." Riggenbach increased the number of times to twenty-five. The remarkable thing about this is that Eusebius, living in Caesarea where there was a great Christian library, knew Matthew 28: 19 in a form which omitted "Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

---

[1] There are of course a few exceptions, such as D, the Ferrar group, and some others.

According to Lake, the importance of this for the textual critic is two-fold: (1) It probably enables him to edit the text without these words, and to regard them as an interpolation. Eusebius could not have omitted the words on purpose. "Baptismal custom would secure the insertion of the words: nothing known to history would account for their omission." And it is significant that there are two other passages containing baptismal texts which have been shown to be due to interpolation. These are Mark 16: 16, which is now admitted to be a part of the spurious conclusion of the second gospel, and the account of the baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch which inserts a demand for a confession of faith as a preliminary to baptism.

(2) It shows that doctrinal modifications of the text are so early, for the most part, that it is vain to expect much manuscript evidence. The task must be approached on another basis.

> A small amount of evidence is sufficient to establish the claim to consideration of readings which are likely to have been obnoxious to early doctrine, and probably we may say that, at least in attempting to reconstruct the text which lies behind the local texts, we ought sometimes to regard with suspicion readings, against which we can produce no external testimony, but only contextual unsuitability, and to be prepared to give a tolerant hearing to the claims of conjectural emendation in such cases.
>
> Instead, therefore, of working with a single Greek text which has a few various readings at the bottom of the page, the scholar of the future, as soon as the textualists have supplied him with the material, must use, in the first place, a series of local texts, differing in many important readings, and in the second, a reconstructed original text, which cannot be proved to have been used by any definite Church, but which must lie behind and explain all the local texts.[1]

This will alter the task of the textual critic quite considerably. He will want to know not only what the original meaning of a passage was, but also "what the Church thought it meant and how it altered its wording in order to emphasize its meaning."[2] An example is found in Matthew 28: 19. Aphraates does

---

[1]I take it to mean that in this argument Lake proceeds on an assumption similar to the one made in this thesis, namely, that if the motivating forces present in the early church can be identified we shall be provided with valuable means for reconstructing the original.

[2]The suggestion has been made that an additional category might be included in our list and termed "ecclesiastical." The implication contained in the suggestion is certainly valid, and this discussion by Lake of the Trinitarian Formula would bear it

not have the baptismal gloss, therefore the assumption may be made that the Church to which he belonged did not have it, and did not interpret the passage to mean the baptism of all converts. On the other hand, the early Western church did have it, and the implication is that it interpreted the command to make disciples as including the baptism of all converts. The modern exegete has to choose between the two readings.

Furthermore, single passages must be treated in connection with similar passages. If the text of the other passage is modified by textual criticism, the exegesis and probably the textual criticism of the first passage may also be altered.

Lake gives as an example of this principle the attitude we must take toward John 3: 5 as a result of our changed attitude toward Matthew 28: 20. He argues that since the context does not call for the inclusion of the phrase "by water and," since the tendency in the Church was to connect regeneration with baptism, since Ecclesiastical writings like the Apostolic Constitutions and the Clementine Homilies show traces of manipulating the passage on behalf of doctrine, and since Justin Martyr's text does not seem to have contained the reference to water, the chances are that it is no longer safe "to neglect the possibility that the reference to baptism, based on the mention of water in verse 5 may be due to an already recognized tendency in the early church to insert such allusions." Lake's conclusion is that the exegete of John 3: 5 will be bound to give attention to the kind of evidence which he has adduced as pointing to the original existence of a different text.

This process of change for dogmatic purposes is discernible in the very process of Gospel formation; in Matthew and Luke as against Mark, and in the Fourth Gospel as against the Synoptics. Goguel has made a list of variants which he thinks are of dogmatic origin, "designed to bring the New Testament text into better harmony with the ideas received in the Church:[1]

---

out. Since, however, the matter of dogma is so inseparably related to the Church, it seems sufficient simply to recognize the ecclesiastical influence, and to treat any possible examples under the present heading.

[1]Maurice Goguel, Le texte et les éditions du Nouveau Testament grec (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1920), pp. 64 ff.

John 7: 8 οὐ] οὔπω.
Matt. 4: 24 ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς] πάντες ἐθεράπευσεν.

Items that did not agree with the supernatural birth were eliminated.

Matt. 1: 16
Luke 2: 5 With Mary his wife who was pregnant Syr^{s} b c
With Mary his betrothed wife A Δ Θ.
Luke 2: 43 Mary and Joseph οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ. Joseph and his mother A C N X.
Luke 2: 22 τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν] τ. κ. αὐτῆς.
Luke 22: 43-44 omit bloody sweat ℵA B N Syr^{s}.
John 1: 18 μονουενὴς υἱὸς] μ. θεὸς.
Acts 20: 28 τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου] τ. ε. τοῦ θεοῦ.
Jude 4: δεσπότην + θεόν.
Acts 16: 7 τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ] τὸ πνεῦμα.
Mark 13: 32 -οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός X.938.1689.
Acts 8: 37 in E 307 322 323: "He said to Philip, If you believe with your whole heart it is lawful. And he answering said, I believe Jesus Christ to be the Son of God."
I Cor. 15: 51 πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα becomes πάντες κοιμηθησόμεθα οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα in C F G X.

An illustration of the increasing recognition being given to dogmatic motivation in its relation to the New Testament text is supplied by a fairly recent article by Wilbert F. Howard.[1] A partial summary of this is presented here.

Westcott and Hort, says Howard, believed that the result of their labors was a text which goes back, as far as our knowledge will take us, to the original autographs of the New Testament. Dean Burgon, however, assailed this text along three lines of attack: (1) an overwhelming preponderance of witnesses is on the side of the Traditional Text, (2) the Traditional Text preserved the words of Holy Scripture in a form which had been the treasured possession of the Church for a thousand years and half a thousand more, and (3) those other forms of the Traditional Text are marked, not only by signs of gross slovenliness but by deliberate falsifications of the true text.

No attention need be paid the first two arguments, but the third is "pregnant with possibilities." Source-criticism of the Gospels points to the presence of variation for dogmatic purposes in the later Gospels themselves.

---

[1]Wilbert F. Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine upon the Text of the New Testament," The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (January, 1941), pp. 1-16.

> If Matthew could correct "Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, even God," into "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good"; or if the words attributed to Jesus by Mark, "Not even the Son" in the saying, "of that day nor hour no man knoweth," can be omitted by later Evangelists, why should we expect a more detached attitude at the time when early scribes were handling books that had not yet reached the stage of cononical sacrosanctity.[1]

Howard questions Hort's statement which is to the effect that while it is true that dogmatic preferences to a great extent determined theologians, and probably scribes, in their choice between rival readings already in existence, nevertheless accusations of wilful tampering with the text are groundless with a single exception. The one exception of which Hort speaks is Marcion's edition of the Gospel and Apostle.

Howard hesitates to take exception with so able a scholar as Hort but suggests that it is a "healthy sign when students come to look upon Textual Criticism as something related to the organic life of the Christian community." This Professor Turner and Dr. Rendel Harris have done. The former of these men thirty years ago pointed out that

> a Church Historian may perhaps venture to think that something of the difficulties which repel so many students from the subject of textual criticism is due to the habit of treating it too much as a matter of the criticism and classification of documents, and too little as a branch of living history. After all the New Testament was the possession of the Christian Society, and it is the experience of the New Testament at the hands of Christian scribes and Christian scholars that form the subject-matter of our enquiry.

Rendel Harris commented that the Textual Criticism of the New Testament is on one side "a mere algebra of the combinations of the various alphabets," and on the other, "it is a study which is as full of interest and of meaning as Church History itself, to which it properly forms a literary pendant, and without which it often cannot be understood." Harris took four passages to illustrate his method: Luke 4: 6, John 1: 34, Luke 22: 43-44, and Luke 23: 34. He places perhaps all four of these in the first half of the second century, each displaying evidence of dogmatic influence.

The author of the article points out, properly enough,

---

[1] But dogma continued after canonicity had become an established fact.

that the danger of this method is that we "should start with certain controversies and look for textual phenomena which will fit into our expectation of what ought to have happened." Nevertheless, the article suggests that the Sacraments, the Person of Christ which involves the Virgin Birth, heretical tendencies, specifically Docetism, and the sufferings of Christ were points of conflict which influenced the text for dogmatic reasons.

Dogmatic Variation in the Writings of Justin and Clement

The somewhat extended discussion of this category is justified by the fact that the majority of instances discussed in this thesis must be included in it. This circumstance alone would refute Hort's dictum that there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes. The mass of evidence to the contrary is overwhelming. It suggests that the degree of dogmatic influence on the text was even greater than even the most radical critic has intimated. The space allotted to the subject in books on textual theory ought therefore to move in proportion to the importance which it is seen to possess. Insight into the condition of the text will be gained by a consideration of the areas of Christian tradition which gave rise to that condition. Hort placed his confidence in the genealogical method, and repudiated the possibility of dogmatic variation. Today, the genealogical method is losing status, but methods based on our knowledge of the organic life of the Christian community are gaining ground. A reconstruction of the text based on a recognition of the early Christian use of dogma takes its place in this latter trend. Hort's extremes of confidence and distrust have therefore to some extent been reversed.

Instances of Dogmatic Variation

Class A

Example 1

Ap. 1. 15. 9	Matt. 5: 46
εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; καὶ γὰρ οἱ πόρνοι τουτο ποιοῦσιν.	ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχι καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.

Τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε. Of this rendering by Justin, G. T. Purves says:

> It is not improbable that he was led to do this by the thought which he has already expressed in the preceding chapter, of the new morality which Christianity had introduced.[1]

That this phrase was no mere accident is shown by its repetition in connection with borrowing and lending in the same chapter. The explanation which Purves offers is probably the correct one. He points out that the phrase, "For even the fornicators do this," recalls the "mention of Christian charity with which he had opened his description of the new morality."[2] His statement in chapter 14, "We who formerely delighted in fornication, but now embrace chastity alone" etc., ties in well with his use of οἱ πόρνοι in the succeeding chapter. In each case, then, the reference is to the new morality stressed in chapter 14 as over against that of paganism.

The position set forth here is strengthened by Westcott's conclusion:

> The change of the word [καινὸς for περισσός] . . . . falls in with the peculiar object of Justin's argument, who wished to show the reformation wrought in men by Christ's teaching. The repetition of the phrase in two passages closely connected was almost inevitable.[3]

Examples 2 and 3

Ap. 1. 16. 6	Matt. 22: 37; cf. Mark 12: 30
Μεγίστη ἐντολή ἐστι κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου, κύριον τὸν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε.	Ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου.

---

[1] G. T. Purves, The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity (New York: A. D. F. Randolph and Company, 1889), p. 199.

[2] Ibid.

[3] B. F. Westcott, The Canon of the New Testament (6th ed.; Cambridge: Macmillan & Company, 1889), p. 140.

It will be advantageous to study the closely succeeding quotation in connection with the above.

Ap. i. 16. 7	Mark 10: 18
Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ θεός ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα.	Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός.

Bousset again holds to the idea that Justin knew of a text showing the peculiarities of at least the former of these quotations. It is probable, he thinks, that Justin read these words in his text: κύριον τὸν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε but that he may have added the similar wording εἰ μὴ ὁ θεός ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα.[1] He brings to the aid of his position the reading of the Didache: Πρῶτον ἀγαπήσεις τὸν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε.

On the other hand, Purves uses these quotations to illustrate the probability that Justin did not use other than our Gospels:

> Justin quotes differently in different places the same Gospel passages. Thus in the Apology he gives as Christ's reply to the rich young man, "None is good but God alone, who made all things"; in the Dialogue, "Why callest thou me good? One is good, my Father who is in heaven". In the Apology we read, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, with all thy heart, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself."[2]

The inconsistency of his wording here would indicate that he did not necessarily draw the variant from a source other than our Gospels, or if he did so, he did it with intent.

Why, then, does the reading κύριον τὸν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε appear? To the present writer there is a very probable explanation. If one studies the Apology closely he will be impressed by the recurring emphasis on the creatorship of God.[3] As a matter of fact Justin rarely misses the opportunity of calling attention to this fact so basic to his thinking. Thus, here in chapter 16, when he is thinking of God, and man's relation to him in such high terms, it is the most natural thing for him to rest upon his

---

[1] Wilhelm Bousset, Evangeliencitate Justins des Martyrers (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1891), pp. 85 f.

[2] Purves, op. cit., pp. 210 ff.

[3] Justin Apology i. 7, 10, 13, 20, 26, 28, 43, 44.

fundamental principle of the creatorship of God. His use of the verb ποιέω in the two adjacent quotations strengthens the idea that this lies behind the usage. A pre-conceived theological concept is responsible for the variant.

Example 4

Dialogue 77. 4	Matt. 2: 1
ἅμα γὰρ τῷ γεννηθῆναι αὐτὸν μάγοι ἀπὸ Ἀρραβίας παραγενόμενοι προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ.	Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν Βηθλεὲμ . . . . ἰδοὺ μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα . . . .

Another variant from the familiar Gospel tradition is the locating of the Magi in Arabia. The Gospel account says simply that they were from "the east." What lies back of this departure?

It may be significant that eight times out of nine Justin refers to these men, not simply as "the Magi," but as "the Magi from Arabia." It is as if he were trying to impress on the minds of his hearers or readers the fact that they were from Arabia. This, as we shall see, becomes the key factor in his argument from the Old Testament.

The argument really begins with chapter 66 of the Dialogue. There, he quotes to Trypho Isaiah 43 in order to show that Christ was "born of a virgin, and that his birth of a virgin had been predicted by Isaiah." This quotation from Isaiah includes the words which Justin soon makes the center of his argument:

> For before the child knows how to call father or mother, he shall receive the power of Damascus, and the spoil of Samaria, in presence of the king of Assyria.

He meets the argument in chapter 77. Trypho requests him to do so since he as a Jew would refer the words of Isaiah to Hezekiah. Justin's reply is:

> I shall do as you wish. But show me yourselves first of all how it is said of Hezekiah, that before he knew how to call father or mother, he received the power of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria in the presence of the king of Assyria. For it will not be conceded to you, as you wish to explain it, that Hezekiah waged war with the inhabitants of Damascus and Samaria in presence of the king of Assyria. "For before the child knows how to call father or mother," the prophetic word said, "He shall take the power of Damascus and spoils of Samaria in presence of the king of Assyria." For if the Spirit of prophecy had not made the statement with an addition, "Before the child knows how to call father or mother, he shall take the power of Damascus and spoils of

> Samaria," but had only said, "And shall bear a son, and he shall take the power of Damascus and spoils of Samaria," then you might say that God foretold that he would take these things, since He foreknew it. But now the prophecy has stated it with this addition: "Before the child knows how to call father or mother, he shall take the power of Damascus and spoils of Samaria." And you cannot prove that such a thing ever happened to any one among the Jews. But we are able to prove that it happened in the case of our Christ. For at the time of His birth, Magi who came from Arabia worshipped Him, coming first to Herod, who then was sovereign in your land, and whom the Scripture calls king of Assyria on account of his ungodly and sinful character. For you know that the Holy Spirit oftentimes announces such events by parables and similitudes; just as he did towards all the people in Jerusalem, frequently saying to them, "Thy father is an Amorite, and thy mother a Hittite."

In this way he disposes of two difficulties, namely, the possibility that the words might refer to Hezekiah, and the difficulty attended by the reference to the "king of Assyria." The latter becomes the Herod of the Gospels. This contributes considerably to his argument that the words from Isaiah refer to Christ. But what about the first part of the quotation: "Before the child knows how to call father or mother, he shall take the power of Damascus and spoils of Samaria?" He now attends to this difficulty.

The words spoken by Jeremiah, "a voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and much wailing, Rachel weeping for her children; and she would not be comforted, because they are not," refer to the massacre of the children by Herod. Ramah he identifies with Arabia for "there is in Arabia at this very time a place called Rama." And the quotation, "He shall take of the power of Damascus and spoils of Samaria," refers to the visit of the Magi:

> For that expression of Isaiah, "He shall take the power of Damascus and spoils of Samaria," foretold that the power of the evil demon that dwelt in Damascus should be overcome in Christ as soon as he was born; and this is proved to have happened. For the Magi, who were held in bondage for the commission of all evil deeds through the power of that demon, by coming to Christ shows that they have revolted from that dominion which held them captive; and this [dominion] the Scripture has showed us to reside in Damascus. Moreover, that sinful and unjust power is termed well in parable, Samaria. And none of you can deny that Damascus was and is, in the region of Arabia, although now it belongs to what is called Syrophoenicia.

Hence the logic of the argument is intact. The voice of lamentation and wailing was heard in Arabia (Ramah) where the power of evil had been broken as witnessed by the coming of the

Magi to worship Christ. Our contention is that the desire to make the argument logically possible can account for the variation.[1]

Example 5

Dialogue 78. 5	Luke 2: 7
Γεννηθέντος δὲ τότε τοῦ παιδίου ἐν Βηθλεέμ, ἐπειδὴ Ἰωσὴφ οὐκ εἶχεν ἐν τῇ κώμῃ ἐκείνῃ που καταλῦσαι, ἐν σπηλαίῳ τινὶ σύνεγγυς τῆς κώμας κατέλυσε· καὶ τότε αὐτῶν ὄντων ἐκεῖ, ἐτετόκει ἡ Μαρία τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἐν φάτνῃ αὐτὸν ἐτεθείκει.	Καὶ ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον, καὶ ἐσπαργάνωσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνέκλινεν αὐτὸν ἐν φάτνῃ, διότι οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι.

This departure from the familiar tradition has been the object of considerable speculation. A. F. Findlay has contributed to the discussion which has centered about it. He says:

> How the cave came to be associated with the birth of Jesus we do not know. It may have been due to the influence of legends current in the heathen world; stories of the birth of gods in caves were not uncommon.

And in connection with the use of "the cave" in the Protevangelium of James, Findlay writes:

> The cave was much more suitable for our author's purpose than a stable in Bethlehem. When we bear in mind that one aim of the book was to remove from the account of the antecedents of the life of Jesus anything that suggested the obscurity and poverty of a humble lot, we understand that the manger in St. Luke's narrative was an inconvenient detail. . . . . The cave which displaced the stable and the manger commended itself to the author of the Protevangelium probably for two reasons. It was, firstly, a secret place far from the abodes of men--the cave was not in Bethlehem, but three miles from it in a desert region; where more fitly could the great mystery of the birth of Jesus have been transacted? And secondly, the cave was a fit symbol of the dark world into which Jesus was born; there in the darkness shone the dazzling light which signalized the advent of the Savior. Whether this be the true explanation of the change which the author made in St. Luke's narrative, the fact remains that he did not scruple to alter the earlier accounts which lay before him.[2]

---

[1] Isa. 60: 6 may have been important in suggesting Arabia to Justin's mind. So also in the Jerusalem Talmud (Ber. ii 4. p. 5), an Arab tells a Jew that Messiah is born. See also Tertullian Adv. Jud. 9 and Adv. Marc. iii. 12 ff.

[2] A. F. Findlay, Byways in Early Christian Literature (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1923), pp. 163 f.

In another place Findlay points out that

> Hermes was born in a cave in Arcadia; the birth of Mithra is represented on several monuments by a figure emerging from the cleft of a rock. The cave played a great part in Mithraism. In their use of a cave Justin suggested that the followers of Mithra borrowed from Christianity under Satanic influence.[1]

Franz Cumont comments that

> apparently the attempt was made to discern in the legend of the Iranian hero the counterpart of the life of Jesus, and the disciples of the Magi probably drew a direct contrast between the Mithraic worship of the shepherds, the Mithraic communion and ascension, and those of the Gospels. The rock of generation, which had given birth to the genius of light, was even compared to the immovable rock, emblem of Christ, upon which the Church was founded; and the crypt in which the bull had perished was made the counterpart of that in which Christ is said to have been born in Bethlehem.[2]

We know now how closely Mithraism rivalled Christianity for the place of first position in the religious realm. Said Renan: "If Christianity had been arrested in its growth by some mortal malady, the world itself would have become Mithraistic." By the middle of the second century Mithraism was a force to be reckoned with throughout the Empire.

Having so formidable a rival, it was inevitable that the protagonists of Christianity should direct some of their apologetic against it. Furthermore, as they did in the case of Judaism, it was inevitable that they should claim items of particular value in the cult as their very own, and as having had a Christian origin. At best all that the Mithraic practices could be would be <u>imitations</u> of originally Christian practices.

The following seems to be a characteristic description of the Mithraic caves or crypts and indicates their importance and appeal:

> The sanctuaries of Mithra were caves in the mountains or underground crypts, recalling the primeval cave in which the god performed the life-giving act of slaying the cosmic bull. These chapels were always small, and when the brotherhood grew beyond a convenient size--a hundred members at the maximum--other Mithraea were established. In small shrines such as these, the impressions made on the mind of the neophyte were bound to be very intimate and personal. It was a place, too, for mystical religious experience, where the de-

---

[1] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 327, n. 160.

[2] Franz Cumont, <u>The Mysteries of Mithra</u>, trans. T. J. McCormack (2d ed.; Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1910), pp. 194 f.

votee could feel himself close to divinity. In the limited nave of the chapel stood venerated images: the torch bearers, the mysterious lion-headed Cronus, and the "Petrogenes Mithra" rising from the generative rock. In the centre of the apse stood the group of "Tauroctonus Mithra," a pathetic tableau, but the central scene of a great salvation drama. Around it were grouped in small panels other scenes from the life of Mithra. . . . . The ceiling was decorated to represent the heavens, and astronomical symbols were frequent elsewhere in the decorations. The crypt as a whole was arranged like a microcosm wherein the neophyte had an opportunity to come close to things divine. Such were the physical surroundings amid which the candidates for initiation participated in the Mithraic Sacraments. Though the sanctuaries were small, they were effectively arranged and lighted to make the initiatory rites highly impressive.[1]

The fact that these cave shrines were so important in Justin's day, and the tradition of the rock-begotten god so prominent was not lost on the Christian group. They themselves looked to a Savior who had had no ordinary birth. He was, in fact, miraculously born of a virgin. And the place of his birth was most unusual; it did not take place in any ordinary house or inn, but in a cave.

Justin goes further and says that this fact was foretold by Daniel and by Isaiah. And, what is perhaps even more significant, asserts that the followers of Mithra have merely "imitated" Daniel and Isaiah. These Old Testament predictions Justin asserts were of Christ not of Mithra. The quotation follows:

> And when those who record the mysteries of Mithra say that he was begotten of a rock, and call the place where those who believe in him are initiated a cave, do I not perceive here that the utterance of Daniel, that a stone without hands was cut out of a great mountain, has been imitated by them, and that they have attempted likewise to imitate the whole of Isaiah's words. For they contrived that the words of righteousness be quoted also by them. But I must repeat to you the words of Isaiah referred to in order that from them you may know that these things are so. They are these: "Hear ye that are afar off, what I have done; those that are near shall know my might. The sinners in Zion are removed; trembling shall seize the impious. Who shall announce to you the everlasting place? The man who walks in righteousness, speaks in the right way, hates sin and unrighteousness, and keeps his hands pure from bribes, stops the ears from hearing the unjust judgment of blood, closes the eyes from seeing unrighteousness: he shall dwell in the lofty cave of the strong rock . . . .[2]

---

[1] H. R. Willoughby, Pagan Regeneration (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929), pp. 154 f.

[2] Justin Dialogue 70.

Also in Chapter 78 he has the following:

> But when the Child was born in Bethlehem, since Joseph could not find a lodging in that village, he took up his quarters in a certain cave near the village; and while they were there Mary brought forth the Christ and placed him in a manger, and here the Magi who came from Arabia found Him. I have repeated to you, I continued what Isaiah foretold about the sign which foreshadowed the cave.[1] Then I repeated the passage from Isaiah which I have already written, adding that, by means of those words, those who presided over the mysteries of Mithras were stirred up by the devil to say that in a place, called among them a cave, they were initiated by him.

The popularity of the cave idea in Mithraism was one aspect of the motivation behind Justin's usage. Its primary relationship to Christianity is proved by reference to Old Testament scripture which the Mithraic cult had merely copied. Its original application was to Christ.

The other aspect of this claim of a birthplace for the Christian Savior was to give to him some of the prestige belonging to the god of Mithraism. He endeavors to attribute a cosmic association to the birth of Christ.

> And David predicted that He would be born from the womb before sun and moon, according to the Father's will, and made Him known, being Christ, as God, strong and to be worshipped.[2]

Referring again to the Daniel passage he says:

> For when Daniel speaks of "one like unto the Son of Man" who received the everlasting kingdom, does he not hint at this very thing? For he declares that, in saying "like unto the Son of Man," He appeared, and was man, but not of human seed. And the same thing he proclaimed in mystery when he speaks of this stone which was cut out without hands. For the expression "it was cut out without hand" signified that it is not a work of man, but of the will of the Father and God of all things, who brought Him forth.[3]

This, then, is simply another expression of what the miraculous birth of Jesus from a virgin expressed, namely, that he whom the Christians worshipped was no ordinary being.

The inclusion of the cave in the Protevangelium of James makes this position more probable. We have seen how the location in the desert lends to the story the atmosphere of mystery; also how the change from the locale of the lowly manger to a traditional birthplace of the gods makes for prestige for the Christian Savior.

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Justin Apology I. 76. [3] Ibid.

In later writers, the idea of the cave became an accepted fact. Origen writes:

> With respect to the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, if anyone desires . . . . to have additional evidence from other sources, let him know that in conformity with the narrative in the Gospel regarding His birth there is shown the cave in Bethlehem where he was born, and in the cave a manger where He was wrapped in swaddling clothes. That sight is much talked of in the neighbourhood, even among the enemies of the faith, it being said that in the cave was born a certain Jesus whom the Christians worship.[1]

Epiphanius actually attributes the statement about the cave to the author of the third Gospel: "Luke says that the child immediately after His birth was wrapped in swaddling clothes and laid in a manger and cave."[2]

Findlay points out that in the earliest Armenian manuscript of the Gospels (ninth century), Matthew 2: 9 is given as follows: "The star . . . . came and stood over the cave where the child lay."[3] Findlay, however, refutes the notion of Preuschen which is to the effect that this was the original text of Matthew, and that "the cave" was afterward omitted because Christians did not like the parallel suggested by the cave associated with the rites of Mithra.

Example 6

Dialogue 88. 3	Matt. 3: 15, 16; Mark 1: 9, 10; Luke 3: 21, 22
κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ.	No reference to fire in the Gospel account.

Another item for consideration is the reference to the fire which, at the time of Jesus' baptism, was kindled in the

---

[1] Origen Against Celsus i. 51.

[2] Epiphanius Against Heresies li. 9.

[3] Findlay, op. cit., p. 327. This is MS 1111 in the Lazareff Institute, dated 887 A.D. We have checked the reading by means of a facsimile. See Evangile traduit en langue armenienne ancienne, ed. Usevolod Miller (Moscow, 1899). The reading is also supported by MS 544 (Greg.), which is MS 25 of the University of Michigan library, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Jordan.[1] This legend is also found in the writing called "The Preaching of Paul." Some manuscripts of Luke, but not the oldest, contain it. It is also found in Bezae and the Itala version of Matthew.

One is tempted at first glance to refer this kindling of the fire to phenomena accompanying the gift of the Holy Spirit. It may have strong affinities to it. But there is another aspect of Justin's usage which, upon close examination, holds a high degree of probability.

It will be noted that this phenomenon, according to Justin, occurred when Jesus stepped into the water. It is not coincidental with the descent of the Spirit like a dove. This happened when he came out of the water. Now, strange as it may seem, this whole baptismal account is introduced to show, not the humanity of Christ, but his divine power. As he himself says, both the Triumphal Entry and the Baptism were demonstrations to the people that he was the Christ. That was the sole purpose of his baptism. It was not to give him special powers, for he already possessed those powers.

Our contention is that Justin introduced this phenomenon in order to emphasize the fact that Jesus was before his baptism, even as after, the possessor of this divine power (δύναμις). He is asserting this fact through chapters 87 and 88. The following sections from these chapters may be noted:

> The Scripture says that these enumerated powers (Isaiah 11: 1ff.) of the Spirit have come upon Him, not because he stood in need of them, but because they would rest in Him, i.e. would find their accomplishment in Him . . . .

Again,

> It was prophesied that the powers enumerated by Isaiah would come upon Him, not because he needed power, but because these would not continue after Him.

Continuing with the argument, he says that even at the time of Jesus' birth he was in possession of this power, as witness the story of the "Magi from Arabia." Then after an interval of "thirty years more or less," he came to John for baptism. There follows the reference to the fire in the Jordan and the baptism by John:

> And then, when Jesus had gone to the river Jordan, where John was baptizing, and when He had stepped into the water,

---

[1] Justin Dialogue 88.

> a fire was kindled in the Jordan; And when He came out of the water, the Holy Ghost lighted on Him like a dove [as] the apostles of this very Christ of ours wrote.

The fire, then, is a witness to the power inherent in this divine being. We are reminded of the story of Moses and the burning bush. As a matter of fact the space that Justin gives to this Old Testament story makes a consideration of it in this present connection necessary.

Justin contends that the divine being that appeared in the burning bush was not the Father, but the Word. Indeed he makes the identification with Jesus explicit. In connection with a discussion of the story of the burning bush he says:

> But so much is written for the sake of proving that Jesus the Christ is the Son of God and his Apostle, being of old the Word, and appearing sometimes in the form of fire.[1]

He links up with this appearance in the bush, the analogy of fire begotten of fire. As fire is begotten of fire, so the divine Word is begotten of the Father.[2] One wonders if this analogy of fire begotten of fire which relates to the begetting of the divine Word by the Father has any connection in Justin's thought with the variant "this day have I begotten Thee."

One cannot be dogmatic as to how these items fit into the picture. One can hardly doubt that they do figure. It is to be doubted if, even in Justin's own mind, they formed a logically developed pattern.[3]

---

[1]Justin Apology i. 63. See also Dialogue 59, 60, 61.

[2]Other terms given are Wisdom, Power, the Glory of the Begotten.

[3]In two MSS, Codex Vercellensis (a) and Codex Sangermanensis (g^1), this follows Matt. 3: 15: "And when Jesus was being baptized, a great light shone from the water, so that all who were assembled were afraid." Hamlyn Hill suggests that Ephraem's comment (p. 43), "By the shining of the light which was upon the waters, and by the voice which came from heaven," etc., shows that he was acquainted with the story of the fire on the Jordan. But it is uncertain whether he learned it from the Diatessaron or from some other source. Ishodad of Merv (ca. A.D. 850) says that the Diatessaron has, "a great light shone, and the Jordan was surrounded by white clouds, and many troops of spiritual beings were seen singing praises in the air . . . . and a scent of perfumes was wafted from thence" (Mrs. Gibson's Trans., 1911). But this has not come down to us in the text of the Diatessaron. According to Epiphanius the Gospel according to the Hebrews used by the Ebionites said that when Jesus came up out of the water

We may mention here also the explanation of the baptism offered by the Valentinian school. The souls of men, it was believed, must pass through a fiery stream before they reached the bliss of heaven. Sinners were consumed by it, but the righteous passed through unharmed. In the Bohairic fragment from "The Falling Asleep of Mary" we read:

> The river of fire which tosses its waves before thee as the waves of the sea, wherein are proved two portions, the righteous and the sinners--when I pass over it, let it not burn my soul.

Hence, the idea developed that the Jordan represented this transcendental fiery stream, and that Jesus' baptism was a symbolic representation of the Savior's baptism in it. In the Excerpta ex Theodoto we have this transcendental stream mentioned. Jesus sits on its bank to tame its fury and to effect the safe passage of the redeemed.[1] And in the same work we read: οὕτως καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα αὐτοῦ πυρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξείλετο καὶ τὸ πάθος πάθους. But it cannot be determined what connection, if any, Justin's inclusion of the fire in the Jordan had with this legend.

Example 7

Paed. i. 5	Matt. 21: 9; cf. Mark 11: 9; Luke 19: 37, 38; John 12: 13
ὀρεψάμενοι, φησὶ, κλάδους ἐλαίας ἢ φοινίκων οἱ παῖδες ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐκέκραγον λέγοντες· Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβὶδ εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.	οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἔκραζον λέγοντες· Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυείδ, εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

The New Testament text does not mention that the children went out to meet the Lord. There, it is "the crowd," simply, that goes out. It is clear, in the light of the context, why this allusion to the children should be made by the writer. The entire chapter makes the point that the Christians are the "children" of

---

"forthwith a great light shone round about the place." Cf. Sib. Orac. vii. 82-84. According to the pseudo-Cyprianic tractate De rebaptismate 17, the following words occurred in the Preaching of Paul: "When Jesus was being baptized, a fire was seen above the water."

[1]Clement Excerpta ex Theodoto 38. [2]Ibid., 76.

Scripture:

> It remains for us to consider the children whom Scripture points to; then to give the pedagogue charge of them. We are the children. In many ways Scripture celebrates us. . . . . Accordingly, in the gospel "the Lord standing on the shore, says to the disciples . . . . and called aloud, Children, have ye any meat?"--addressing those that were already in the position of disciples as children. . . . .
>
> The prophetic spirit also distinguishes us as children. "Plucking," it is said, "branches of olives or palms, the children went forth to meet the Lord, and cried, saying Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

Clement's argument is responsible for the introduction of the Children at this point. He also knew the statement made by Matthew that in the temple the children joined in the cry of "Hosanna to the Son of David."[1]

This chapter of the Paedagogue is a good example of the way in which non-accidental variation took place, for the instance noted above is but one of several found in the same general context. Others will now be discussed.

Example 6

Paed. i. 5	Matt. 11: 16, 17; cf. Luke 7: 32
αὖθις τε παιδίοις ὁμοιοῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν	Τίνι δὲ ὁμοιώσω τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην; ὁμοία ἐστὶν παιδίοις

---

[1]In a comment, Texts and Studies, V (Cambridge: The University Press, 1899), No. 5, 59, J. Armitage Robinson offers the following comparisons: "With the statement that 'the children' went to meet the Lord with boughs of 'olive' compare Dial. of Timothy and Aquila ὅτι δὲ τὰ νήπια λέγω δὴ οἱ παῖδες τῶν Ἑβραίων, ἀπάντησιν αὐτῷ ἐποιήσαντο μετὰ κλάδων ἐλαιῶν λέγοντες τὸ Ὡσαννά.

"That Tatian's Diatessaron introduced 'the children' at this point is clear: comp. Ephraim's comm., 'The children were saying, Peace in heaven and glory in the highest'; 'Rebuke the children that they hold their peace.' Compare also Acta Pilati A. I. 5 ff. (Tisch. Evv. apocr. 2nd ed. pp. 218 ff.)."

The textual difficulties of the Diatessaron are well known to scholars. It must be said, however, that both the Arabic Version and Ephraem's Commentary introduce the children prior to the entrance into Jerusalem. Considerable trust may be placed in the Arabic as far as the order is concerned. It would appear, therefore, that the introduction of the children at this point may be somewhat earlier than Clement. It would seem that Tatian, running true to his harmonistic method, uses the material from Matthew which refers to the children singing, but agrees with the other Gospels in having only one outburst of this enthusiasm, and that prior to the entrance into Jerusalem.

ἀγοραῖς καθημένοις καὶ λεγουσιν, ηὐλήσαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε, ἐθρήνησαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκόψασθε.	καθημένοις ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ἃ προσφωνοῦντα τοῖς ἑτέροις λεγουσιν· ηὐλήσαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε· ἐθρηνήσαμεν, καὶ οὐκ ἐκόψασθε.

It is to be observed that in Clement the children are likened to the kingdom of heaven, but in the Gospels the comparison is with the men of this generation. Burkitt points out that the first line is "merely introductory."[1] But the fact is that the introduction is for Clement the important part. The quotation proper beginning with ηὐλήσαμεν and ending with ἐκόψασθε has no particular function in the context. But the "introductory" comparison does have. Again, the change is due to the desire to prove the proposition "we are the children of Scripture."

Example 9

Paed. i. 5	Matt. 25: 33
Καὶ τὰ ἀρνία δὲ μου ὅταν λέγῃ, στήτω ἐκ δεξιῶν, τοὺς ἀφελεῖς αἰνίττεται παῖδας.	Καὶ στήσει τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ.

Two facts are of interest in this quotation. The first is the personal note given to the reading: "Let my lambs [ἀρνία] stand on my right." This creates an atmosphere quite different from the rather austere and impersonal one of Matthew and entirely in keeping with the context.

The other fact has to do with the change from the of the Gospels to the use of the diminutive ἀρνίον signifying a young lamb. In this connection, note the immediate context:

> And when he says, "Let my lambs stand on my right," he alludes to the simple children as if they were sheep and lambs in nature, not men; and the lambs he counts worthy of preference, from the superior regard he has to that tenderness and simplicity of disposition in men which constitutes innocence.

That the change is deliberate is further demonstrated by the successive references to the Christians as "sucking calves," "gentle doves," and "chickens" in the same chapter.

---

[1]See P. M. Barnard, The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria (Cambridge: The University Press, 1899), pp. xi, xii.

Example 10

Paed. 1. 5	Eph. 4: 13
μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ.	μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ.

The omission here of τοῦ υἱοῦ is of special significance since the quotation from Ephesians of verses 13-15 is otherwise exact. Tollinton has pointed out that when quoting from Ephesians, Clement "appears to have referred usually to his copy."[1] It is unlikely, then, that this omission was accidental.

This becomes more pointed when one considers the further matter that Clement is here quoting a statement that has to do with "Gnosis." When he is dealing with this subject one must be particularly watchful, for it is one about which he feels strongly.

Nevertheless, in this instance it is not easy exactly to identify the motivating principle lying back of the omission. We may, however, offer the following suggestion. It has long been observed that two trends lie in Clement's thinking about the nature of the Logos. One of these just about makes the identification of the Logos and God complete. The other emphasizes the individuality and subordination of the former with the result that Clement has been subject to severe criticism. It may be that here in this omission is a reflection of the second of these trends. The believer is to attain no secondary experience, no ἐπιγνώσεως (full knowledge) of the Son, but of God himself. In other words he will attain to the Beatific Vision itself. Perhaps the difference is not always clear. Yet there seems to be a difference at times. In any case, the reference to the ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ would tend to obscure the point on which he elsewhere insists, namely, the realization of the complete knowledge of God.[2]

---

[1] R. B. Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London: Williams and Norgate, 1914), II, 187.

[2] F, G, g, Lcif. also omit τοῦ υἱοῦ. This may suggest a canon of criticism to the effect that the shorter reading is to be preferred. It may be, therefore, that the true variant here is the insertion of τοῦ υἱοῦ.

Example 11

Paed. 1. 5	I Thess. 2: 6, 7
δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι ὡς χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι ἐγενήθημεν ἤπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, ὡς ἂν τροπὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς.	δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι ὡς χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι· ἀλλὰ ἐγενήθημεν ἤπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐὰν τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα. . . . .

Clement and Tischendorf agree in reading ἤπιοι, but it is to be observed that many, and, in fact, the "best" manuscripts differ in that they read νήπιοι: Aleph*, B, C*, D*, F, G, 31, 102, 103, 104*, 122, 142, 206, 263, 321, 326**, 429, 460**, 1906. The Vulgate, the Latin Versions accompanying D, E, F, G (e testifying against its own Greek), have parvuli, and so the Bohairic, Ethiopic, Origen, Ambrosiaster, Jerome, Augustine.[1] Moreover, not all texts of the Paedagogue read ἤπιοι. What Stählin calls the M text has νήπιοι.

On the other hand, ἤπιοι is vouched for by Aleph**, A, C**, D**, E, K, L, P, 33, 257, 440, 1908 by both Syriac versions, by the Sahidic and its follower the Fayumic, by the Armenian, Basil, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Euthalius, Oecumenius, John Damascene.

It is clear, then, that there is important attestation for both readings. For ἤπιοι it can be said that νήπιοι might easily result from the reduplication of the letter N in HMENHITIOI.

Scrivener rejects νήπιοι with the words:

> How St. Paul can compare himself to a babe in one clause of the verse and to its nurse in the other would be quite unintelligible if Origen, who read νήπιοι, had not instructed us that the nurse is playing at baby for the baby's amusement [ἐγένετο νήπιος καὶ παραπλήσιος τροφῷ θαλπούσῃ τὸ ἑαυτῆς παιδίον καὶ λαλούσῃ λόγους ὡς παιδίον διὰ τὸ παίδιον , iii. 662]. It needs but the exercise of common sense to brush away such a fancy as this, and the state of the evidence will show us how the best authorities are sometimes hopelessly in the wrong.[2]

Bishop Lightfoot, on the other hand, champions νήπιοι. He points out that "the inversion of the metaphor which it intro-

---

[1]The identifications are by Scrivener, but the Gregory numeration is used. The asterisks indicate the correctors.

[2]Scrivener, op. cit., p. 389.

duces, the Christian teacher being first compared to the child and then to the mother, is quite in Paul's manner.[1] Westcott and Hort, moreover, have seen fit to incorporate it in their text.

Whatever the original reading may have been, Clement's method of using it is both interesting and instructive. It provided him with exactly the right type of material in the development of his argument. The Christians, he has asserted, are the "children" of Scripture. But the term "children" might be and probably was misconstrued by the opponents of the Christian movement. It was interpreted in its immature aspects. Clement's purpose was to counteract this fallacy. The Christians are in no sense childish (νηπύτιος); they are characterized by gentleness: they are ἥπιοι.

Clement so closely identifies the two words that, so far as he is concerned, distinction is almost obliterated. He explains the difference thus: οὐκ ἐπὶ ἀφρόνων τάττεται τὸ νήπιον, νηπύτιος μὲν γὰρ οὗτος, νήπιος δὲ ὁ νεήπιος, ὡς ἥπιος ὁ ἀπαλοφρων, οἷον ἥπιος νεωστὶ καὶ πρῴος τῷ τρόπῳ γενόμενος.[2]

The stress which Clement has placed upon this passage, and the use which he has made of the similarity of the two words ἥπιοι and νήπιοι, leads me to feel that here, perhaps, we have an instance where the patristic manner of using quotations from the New Testament has definitely influenced the subsequent history of the sacred text.

Example 12

Paed. 1. 5	Matt. 11: 27; cf. Luke 10: 22
θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἔγνω, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.	Καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

---

[1] J. B. Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of Saint Paul (New York: Macmillan Company, 1895), p. 24.

[2] This has been quoted in the Greek since the words are such that translation into English obscures the point he is making. Clement's entire argument should be read if one is to appreciate completely his use of the quotation.

The passage is found in the following places in Clement's writings: Strom. i. 24; i. 28; v. 13; vii. 18; Paed. i. 8; i. 9; Q.D.S. 8.

Barnard says of this passage: "Either Clement and other Fathers were curiously consistent in their misquotation of this verse or else there was a type of text fairly widely current from the second to the fourth century which is not represented in the MSS. and versions now extant."[1] Yet it must be observed that Clement is acquainted with the familiar order of the clauses, even though in the instance under consideration he does not invert the two clauses but quotes the second without the first.[2] He consequently alters the οὐδὲ . . . . τις to οὐδείς.

The suggestion of an early text differing from that of our Gospels does not seem convincing. The great amount of variation among the quotations themselves would not point to another specific text. It seems more logical that the Gospel passage as we know it was freely used to meet the various emphases of the context. The numerous places where it is used will bear this out. The same thing had happened in Justin. The instance at hand will illustrate the point. The immediate context runs:

> Of late God was known by the coming of Christ: "For no man knoweth God but the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal him."

The context is interested, then, in knowledge of God and results in the use of the part of the quotation pertinent to the need. Furthermore, the fact that he speaks of knowledge of God, not of the Father, in the preceding statement has determined his use of the word God rather than Father in the quotation. When, on the other hand, he uses Father in the context, he uses it in the quotation.[3]

Example 13

Paed. 1. 6	Luke 3: 22; cf. Matt. 3: 17; Mark 1: 11; Ps. 2: 7
Αὐτίκα γοῦν βαπτιζομένῳ τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἐπῆχησε φωνὴ μάρτυς ἠγαπημένου Υἱός μου εἶ σὺ ἀγαπητὸς ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.	Καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι· σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

---

[1] Barnard, op. cit., p. 16. [2] Clement Paedagogue i. 9.

[3] Ibid.; Stromata i. 28; v. 13.

It has already been observed that several ancient manuscripts have this reading; also that both Justin and Clement agree in their rendering of it.[1] The theory advanced was that Justin's point of view regarding Scripture and its fulfillment in Jesus, together with the trend of his discussion, determined his use of the words of Psalm 2: 7.

Barnard notes the fact that Clement includes ἀγαπητός in his quotation.[2] He accounts for this on the assumption that ἀγαπητός has slipped in owing to "a reminiscence of the usual text." It appears more probable that Clement was subject to a set of motives similar to those which prompted Justin Martyr to use the same wording. Ἀγαπητός does indeed show that he knew the "usual" text.[3] But the context is here again the deciding element. It demands this appeal to Scripture. And if the Old and New Testament renderings do not agree, harmonistic alterations must be made. Inherently they must be in agreement or else error has come in, and must be corrected. The context may now be noted:

> We are not termed children and infants with reference to the childish and contemptible character of our education. . . . . Straightway, on our regeneration, we attained that perfection after which we aspired. For we were illuminated which is to know God. He is not then imperfect who knows what is perfect. For at the moment of the Lord's baptism there sounded a voice from heaven, as a testimony to the Beloved, "Thou art my beloved Son, today have I begotten Thee." . . . . if he was perfect, why was he, the perfect one baptized? It was necessary, they say, to fulfil the profession that pertained to humanity. Most excellent. Well, I assert, simultaneously with his baptism by John He became perfect? Manifestly. He did not then learn anything more from him? Certainly not. But he is perfected by the washing of baptism--alone, and is satisfied by the descent of the Spirit? Such is the case. The same also takes place in our case, whose exemplar Christ became.

Something, therefore, actually took place at the baptism. It had to do with the extremely important process of attaining the status of the τέλειος. The above quotation continues:

> Being baptized we are illuminated; illuminated, we become sons; being made sons we are made perfect; being made perfect we are made immortal.

It is this sequence that is important: baptism, illumination, sonship, the status of the perfect, and finally that of the immortal. While Clement is not always consistent in his conception of the

---

[1] Supra, p. 27. [2] Barnard, op. cit., p. 38.

[3] For MS evidence see supra, p. 27.

person of Christ, baptism is so important to him that he cannot concede that for Christ it was simply exemplary and nothing more. Something happened there, and that "something" is suggested by the clause ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκά σε.[1]

Example 14

Paed. i. 6	John 1: 3b, 4a
Ὃ γὰρ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωή ἐστιν.	Καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν ὃ γέγονεν. ἐν αὐτῷ ζωή ἐστιν.

Paed. ii. 9 has the following: Ὃ γὰρ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. And Excerpta ex Theodoto, sec. 6, has the rendering: ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ ζωὴ ἦν ἡ σύζυγος, and in section 19 of the same work appears: ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωή ἐστιν. ζωὴ δὲ ὁ κύριος.

In Tischendorf's text the punctuation comes after γέγονεν. But, as Barnard has observed, "it is clear that Clement punctuated after ἔν."[2]

This change in punctuation, of course, made no particular change in the text itself. It meant merely a different way of dividing the structural units of the sentence involved.[3] It may, however, have had theological repercussions, and might conceivably have influenced various readings of Scripture. One has the feeling that it was closely related in Clement's mind with what happened at the baptism. If this is so, the relation between this quotation and that discussed above is very close. They may be compared together: ὃ γὰρ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωή ἐστιν. ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε.

---

[1]Cf. John Patrick, Clement of Alexandria (Edinburgh, 1914), p. 110: "Clement seems to solve the problem by distinguishing between the divine consciousness in Him to which nothing was unknown, and the human consciousness which received enlightenment in the act of baptism."

[2]Barnard, op. cit., p. 52.

[3]Irenaeus Against Heresies i. 8. Hippolytus, Refutation of Heresies v. 8. Ephraem of Syria, Epiphanius, Syr. Cur., etc. follow Clement.

Example 15

Paed. 1. 6	I Cor. 12: 13
Καὶ γὰρ ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες, εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι. καὶ πάντες ἓν πόμα ἐποτίσθημεν.	Καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες, εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν.

The important change is that from πνεῦμα to πόμα. Why the reading as represented by Clement? The matter becomes clear when one recalls the importance he attaches to the Sacraments: Baptism and the Lord's Supper.[1] He finds in I Cor. 12: 13 a reference to each of these. But ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν is obscure. He accordingly changes πνεῦμα to πόμα, making the reference specific. His references in this chapter to both of the Sacraments give credence to this point of view.[2]

Example 16

Paed. 1. 7	John 1: 1
Ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ θεῷ καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.	Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.

Clement quotes or alludes to John 1: 1 on numerous occasions. In Protr. 1 we read: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. . . . . ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ λόγος ἦν . . . . ἦν γὰρ ἐν θεῷ. . . . . In Protr. 10 is found ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ θεῷ. In Paed. i. 2: . . . . λόγος θεὸς ὁ ἐν τῷ πατρί. Other references are Strom. v. 1; Exc. ex Theod. sections 6 and 19.

From these references it will be noticed that Clement tends to substitute ἐν τῷ θεῷ for πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Barnard says

---

[1] Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London, 1914), II, 135 ff.

[2] 465, 469, 618, 2125 have εν πομα εποτισθημεν.
Macarius Homilies 4, 12: και παντες, φησι, το αυτο πομα εποτισθημεν.
Syr.P: unum potum (with Greek πομα in the margin) bibimus.
35, 101, 242, 385, 1905, 1927: εν πομα εποτισθημεν, εις εν πνευμα.

that this is due to the influence of John 10: 38: . . . . ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί.[1] But there is also the theological factor to consider, namely, the distinction in Clement's writings between the Logos and God. As in many of the early writers, Clement seems to desire a distinction, but at times it becomes a distinction without a difference. Tollinton points out that

> in a number of passages the unity and equality of the Son with the Father is implied or directly taught under terms of local or mutual relationship. The Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son. Such duality is compatible with the completest unity, for "both are a unity even God." Clement is fond of varying Saint John's term of relationship [πρός] for one of more local connotation [ἐν].[2]

The instance under consideration is a good example of this "fondness":

> Nothing, then, is hated by God, nor yet by the Word. For both are one--that is God. For he has said "In the beginning the Word was in God [ἐν τῷ θεῷ] and the Word was God."

Example 17

Paed. 1. 8	Matt. 19: 17; cf. Mark 10: 18; Luke 18: 19
Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.[3]	Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός.

The critical apparatus reveals an extensive amount of variation among the ancients with reference to this New Testament passage. Mark 10: 18 has τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός. Luke agrees with Mark. Epiphanius accuses Marcion of adding ὁ πατήρ. The two sections of the text consisting of note and comment follow:

---

[1] Barnard, op. cit., p. 50.

[2] Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London, 1914), I, 343 f.

[3] Clementine Homilies and Chrysostem: ο θεος, και ουκ ειπεν ει μη πατηρ μου, ινα μαθης οτι εξεκαλυψεν εαυτον τω νεανισκω. b, c, ff[1.2], vg. Hier. Nov. add ο θεος; e adds pater. C, E. F. G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, f, g[1], h, m, q, Syr., Sah. Aeth. Eus. Chr. give ουδεις αγαθος ει μη εις ο θεος.

Εἶπε τις πρὸς αὐτόν. Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν, αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; ὁ δὲ μή με λέγε ἀγαθόν. εἷς ἐστιν ἀγαθὸς ὁ θεός. προσέθετο ἐκεῖνος ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας, λέγει τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδα.

Ἵνα μὴ δείξῃ τὰς ἐντολὰς ἤδη προγεγραμμένας λέγει· Τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδα. τὸ δὲ ὅλον κεφάλειον φανερὸν ὑπαρχει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκολουθίας. καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἀγαθὸν φασκει, καὶ θεὸν ὀνομάζει, καλῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ διδάσκει τὸν βουλόμενον τὴν ζωὴν κληρονομῆσαι. καὶ οὐκ ἀθετεῖ οὐ δὲ ἀπωθεῖται. ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ τοὺς ἐν νόμῳ πολιτευσαμένους ζωὴν αἰώνιον κεκληρονομηκέναι, Μωϋσέα τε καὶ τους ἄλλους προφήτας.[1]

But Clement and others were doing the same thing. We have seen that Justin added ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα. The context shows how natural it was for Clement to make the substitution. He uses the appellation "Father" consistently throughout this section:

> Now that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is good, the Word himself will again vouch: "For he is kind to the unthankful and the evil;" and further, when he says, "Be merciful as your Father is merciful." Still further also he plainly says, "none is good, but my Father who is in heaven." In addition to these, again he says, "My Father makes the sun to shine on all" . . . . .
>
> But "no one is good" except His Father. It is the same Father of His, then, who being one is manifested by many powers. . . . . So that it is veritably clear that the God of all is only one good, just Creator, and the Son in the Father.

The point he thus makes is that both justice and goodness in God are not inconsistent. The very term "Father" implies goodness, and since this is so it but remains for him to show that both justice and goodness are but aspects of an essential unity that exists in God.

There is the possibility that ὁ θεός in Mark 10: 18 was added for the sake of clearness. Note the argument of Resch:

> The primitive statement εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός conserved in its simplicity by the first Evangelist, bears the stamp of originality on the face of it. On the other hand, the style adopted by Mark and Luke is of secondary character. But all further words which have been added, as, for example, ὁ θεός ὁ πατήρ, ὁ πατήρ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα are characterized as later epexegetical additions by their diversity and the impossibility of establishing a common Hebrew original for them.[2]

---

[1] Epiphanius Heresies xlii.

[2] Alfred Resch, Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1895), Zweiter Theil, p. 499.

We would not go with Resch in his insistence on an original Hebrew text, but would agree that εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός was very probably the original reading and that the various names and phrases are later additions on behalf of lucidity or some other underlying motive.

Example 18

Paed. ii. 1	Matt. 4: 4
οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ ζήσεται ὁ δίκαιος.	οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ.

Here, Clement has substituted ὁ δίκαιος for ὁ ἄνθρωπος. That this is no accident is shown by the fact that he makes the same substitution elsewhere: οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ δίκαιος ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ῥήματα κυρίου.[1]

How may this change best be understood? Was there some reason why Clement could not say that man in general did not live by bread alone? Perhaps the contexts of the two passages provide a clue. The first of these has to do with eating. Even the most trivial matters relate ultimately to those that are profound:

> We must now compendiously describe what the man who is called a Christian ought to be during the whole of his life. . . . . For whenever any one, who has been brought away by the Word from external things, and from the body itself to the mind, acquires a clear view of what happens according to nature in man, he will know that he is not to be earnestly occupied about external things, but about what is proper and peculiar to man--to purge the eye of the soul, and to sanctify also the flesh. For he that is clean, rid of those things which constitute him still dust, what else has he more servicable than himself for walking in the way which leads to the comprehension of God?

Furthermore,

> Some men, in truth, live that they may eat, as the irrational creatures, "whose life is their belly, and nothing else". But the Instructor enjoins us to eat that we may live. For neither is food our business, nor is pleasure our aim; but both are on account of our life here, which the Word is training up to immortality. . . . .
>
> But let the entertainment depend on love. For it is said, "let the children whom Thou hast loved O Lord, learn that it is not the products of fruits that nourish man; but

---

[1]Clement Paedagogue iii. 7.

it is Thy word which preserves those who believe on Thee". "For the righteous shall not live by bread."[1]

The context of the second passage is also significant:

> We, on our journey to the truth, must be unincumbered. "Carry not," said the Lord, "purse, nor script, nor shoes." . . . . A fair provision for the journey to heaven is theirs who bear frugality with chaste gravity. . . . . He who climbs to the heavens by force, must carry with him the fair staff of beneficence, and attain to the true rest by communicating to those who are in distress. . . . . For he who has the Almighty God, the Word, is in want of nothing, and never in any straights for what he needs. For the Word is a possession that wants nothing and is the cause of all abundance. If one say that he has often seen the righteous man in need of food, this is rare and happens only where there is not another righteous man. Notwithstanding let him read what follows: "For the righteous man [ὁ δίκαιος] shall not live by bread alone, but by the word of the Lord," who is the true bread, the bread of the heavens.[2]

The background of the quotation appears from these passages of the Paedagogue. The Christian is different from the outsider. He is the righteous man. He moves on a level superior to that of the masses of humanity. Others, as Clement implies, may live on the purely physical level. They "live that they may eat, as irrational creatures." But the bread of the Christian is the "true bread, the bread of the heavens."

It may be, too, that the idea of immortality is here involved. Surely it is involved in the conception of the higher life to which the Christian aspires. Clement's figure of the journey to heaven is but typical of his philosophy of the stages through which one must pass in his realization of the Vision of God. Tollinton has a significant paragraph on this matter:

> After all, what is the opprobrium of the Christian name or the taunts of the rabble, compared with the prize of immortality? To this thought he recurs again and again. Immortality is not inherent in human nature as such. It is a gift. It is conditional. It is the higher stage of existence, upon which we enter by the regeneration of the Word. It is the heavenly citizenship wherein man has fellowship with God. This way lies salvation and escape from the degradations of Paganism.[3]

Against this background of thought it is easy to see why Clement could not say that man in general shall not live by bread

---

[1]Reference as in the heading.

[2]Clement Paedagogue iii. 7.

[3]Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London, 1914), I, 220 f.

alone. Man (that is, the masses of men) does live largely on the physical level. The participation in the food of immortality was reserved for the righteous man, that is, for the Christian. Perhaps there is some kinship between this distinction in Clement's religious outlook and that implied by the familiar saying of Plato: "Many are the bearers of the thyrsus, but the Bacchanals are few."[1]

Example 19

Paed. ii. 9	John 1: 5
Καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸν οὐ καταλαμβάνει.	Καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

There are two variants of interest here. We shall deal first with the change from the aorist to the present. That Clement knew the aorist reading is demonstrated by its use in the Excerpta ex Theodoto.[3] But three times in the Paedagogue he uses the present tense. Of this change Kutter says:

> The philosophical generalization must in any case appertain when Clement (Paed. ii. 9. 79) changes the aorist κατέλαβεν (John 1: 5), to the present. When he quotes ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸν οὐ καταλάμβανει, it pleases him to render the thought of the passage in general form . . . . and to give it the status of a Christian truism.[4]

What Kutter has said of the above reference, seems also to be true of its use in Paedagogue ii. 9:

> "Once ye were in darkness, now are ye in the Lord." Hence I am of the opinion man was called by the ancients φώς. But he has not received, say they, the perfect gift. I also

---

[1]Plato Phaedo cited in Willoughby, op. cit., p. 80. Cf. Clement Stromata i. 19: "We do not, indeed, receive absolutely all philosophy, but that of which Socrates speaks in Plato. 'For there are (as they say), in the mysteries many bearers of the thyrsus, but few bacchanals'; meaning 'that many are called, but few chosen.'"

[2]Tatian Address to the Greeks: Και τουτο εστιν αρα το ειρημενον· Η σκοτια το φως ου καταλαμβανει.
Theodoret: Ουτως εστιν το φως της εκκλησιας - και η σκοτια αυτον ου κατελαβεν.
e: et lux lucet--et tenebrae eum non comprehenderunt.

[3]Clement Excerpta ex Theodoto 8.

[4]Hermann Kutter, Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1897), p. 34.

> assent to this; but he is in the light and the darkness comprehendeth [καταλαμβάνει] him not.

Also in Paedagogue ii. 10:

> For one may escape the light of sense, but that of the mind it is impossible to escape. For how, says Heraclitus, can one escape the notice of that which never sets? Let us by no means, then veil ourselves with the darkness; for the light dwells in us. "For the darkness", it is said, "comprehendeth [καταλαμβάνει] it [or possibly 'him'] not."[1]

In each case the reference is not to the Logos, as in the Fourth Gospel, but to the individual Christian. The Christian is now in the light. And that which in the Fourth Gospel was particular, reserved for the Logos himself, has now become generalized so as to include all Christians.

The second variant is the change from αὐτὸ in the Gospel, to αὐτὸν in Clement. This really is one with the change just noted. Barnard says:

> It is clear that Clement read αὐτὸν, not αὐτὸ . . . . . In (969)[2] αὐτὸν is referred to Christ, and both interpretations of κατέλαβεν appear to be recognized.[3]

There is one instance, however, where the text of Stählin has αὐτὸ. But Barnard finds this text uncertain:

> I am inclined to think that an ancestor of P had αὐτὸν ου καταλ. with the correction αὐτὸ in the margin, and that this was copied in by mistake before νύξ: if so αὐτὸ should be struck out, not altered to αὐτῆ with Sylburg.[4]

I am not at all sure that this was the case. It may be that by the same principle that gave us αὐτὸν elsewhere we get αὐτὸ in this context. Here, Clement is emphasizing the light, whereas elsewhere it is the Christian:

> For how, says Heraclitus, can one escape the notice of that which never sets? Let us by no means, then, veil ourselves with the darkness; for the light dwells in us. "For the darkness," it is said, "comprehendeth it not."

Example 20

Paed. ii. 12	I Cor. 2: 9
ὃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν οὐδὲ οὓς ἤκουσε πρότερον.[5]	ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη . . . .

---

[1] Infra. [2] I.e. in Excerpta ex Theodoto 8.

[3] Barnard, op. cit., pp. 52 f. [4] Ibid.

[5] There is no further evidence for πρότερον, but this pas-

Clement is here engaged in warning his readers against excessive fondness for ornaments.

> Let not the ears be pierced, contrary to nature in order to attach to them ear-rings and ear-drops. . . . . Nor could there be any better ornament for the ears than true instruction. . . . . And eyes anointed by the Word, and ears pierced for perception, make a man a hearer and contemplator of divine and sacred things, the Word truly exhibiting the true beauty "which eye hath not seen nor ear heard before."

Now it is to be noted that Clement uses this passage from I Corinthians fifteen times, and it appears consistently in connection with the degree of revelation possessed by the Gnostic.[1] "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard before," but now the Gnostic has achieved this illumination. One or two uses of the quotation will serve to illustrate the point.

In the Stromata he writes:

> The same work, then, presents a difference, according as it is done by fear, or accomplished by love, and is wrought by faith or by knowledge. Rightly, therefore, the rewards are different. To the Gnostic "are prepared what eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor hath entered into the heart of man."[2]

Elsewhere in the same work he writes on the mystic meaning of the tabernacle and its furniture. He also discusses the symbolic aspect of the priest's activity:

> The high priest, putting off his sacred robe . . . . washes himself, and putting on the other tunic . . . . exhibiting, as it seems to me, the Levite and the Gnostic. . . . . But purified already by the Gnostic Word in his whole heart, and thoroughly regulated, and having improved that mode of life received from the priest to the highest pitch, being quite sanctified both in word and life, and having put on the bright array of glory, and received the ineffable inheritance of that spiritual and perfect man, "which eye hath not seen and ear hath not heard, and it hath not entered into the heart of man," and having become son and friend, he is now replenished with insatiable contemplation face to face.[3]

And again in the Stromata he writes:

> Wherefore also this fragmentary philosophy (i.e. the Hellenic), is very elementary, while truly perfect science deals with intellectual objects, which are beyond the sphere of the world, and with objects still more spiritual than these which

---

sage seems to have been made good use of by certain Gnostics who used it in support of an esoteric doctrine. Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, Notes (New York: Macmillan Company, 1895), pp. 176 ff.

[1] Cf. Otto Stählin, Clemens Alexandrinus (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1936), vierter Band, p. 19.

[2] Clement Stromata iv. 18. [3] Ibid., v. 6.

> "eye saw not and ear heard not, nor did it enter into the heart of men," till [πρὶν], the Teacher told the account of them to us; unveiling the holy of holies; and in ascending order, things still holier than these, to those who are truly and not spuriously heirs of the Lord's adoption.[1]

It may be concluded from these usages that what we have is further evidence showing how truly illuminated was the Gnostic in Clement's opinion.[2] To him had been opened a whole new world which hitherto had been inaccessible, and was still so to the non-Christian. This idea of the new revelation through the Logos was responsible for the addition of πρότερον.

Example 21

Paed. iii. 10	I Pet. 2: 12
Τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλήν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν, ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύσαντες δοξάσωσι τὸν θεόν.	Τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλήν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν, ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσιν τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς.

The omission from Clement's quotation of ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς strikes the eye at a glance. The phrase should be translated "in the day of visitation" or "in the day of punishment." While it is true that Clement has very definite convictions as to judgment and punishment, nevertheless they are not central in his thinking. Says Tollinton:

> He says little of the final judgment. It is referred to, indeed, as an accepted doctrine, but Clement is concerned very slightly with the future episodes of the present dispensation. He never dwells on the second Advent and knows of no earthly Millenium. . . . . In Eschatology he stands at the opposite pole from Papias, who only preceded him by one generation. Clement's future is that of the soul's perfect communion with God: he looks for no cosmic catastrophies, but for the fulfilment of spiritual hopes. . . . . The influence of Gnosticism is unmistakable.[3]

This may indicate why he would avoid a reference to

---

[1] Ibid., vi. 8.

[2] For a good discussion of Clement's Gnosticism cf. Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London, 1914), II, 72-101.

[3] Ibid., p. 116.

eschatology. It was too peripheral in his thinking for that.[1]

There is, however, the further fact that Clement is here writing on very practical matters relating to wearing apparel. To refer the impression made on the Gentiles to some distant event would be absurd. His motivation is at once theological and practical.

Example 22

Strom. i. 19	I Cor. 13: 12
βλέπομεν γὰρ νῦν ὡς δι' ἐσόπτρου.	βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι.

Consistently throughout the Pedagogue and the Stromata Clement omits ἐν αἰνίγματι when quoting this passage. But that he knew the common reading is suggested by its use in the Excerpta ex Theodoto: ἄρτι βλέπομεν δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, τότε δὲ πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον.[2] But it should be said that it is a real question as to the degree to which the Excerpta ex Theodoto represents Clement's own ideas. Casey characterizes it, together with the so-called eighth book of the Stromata and the Eclogae Propheticae, as "an almost unique survival from antiquity of an author's notebook." This notebook, he thinks, contains, in part, "direct quotations from philosophical and Gnostic works, in part, Clement's summaries of his reading in them, in part, independent attempts at exegesis, criticism, or theological construction." The Excerpta, he thinks, consists chiefly of quotations from Valentinian works, to which some criticism and theological speculation has been added.[3]

The omission is most interesting. Commonly translated "darkly," ἐν αἰνίγματι means "a dark saying" or "a riddle." The omission probably grows out of Clement's reluctance to assert that the true Gnostic now sees only in riddles or enigmas. To do so would be to deny the central conviction regarding "gnosis," namely,

---

[1]It is to be noted that εποπτευω is a mystery cult term.

[2]Clement Excerpta ex Theodoto 15. D, E, Thdrt., Tert. have ως before δι, as does Clement. Or[2] has και αινιγματος and εν εσοπτρω κ. εν αιν. . . . .

[3]R. P. Casey, The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria (London: Christophers, 1934), p. 4.

that the individual may achieve a vision of God himself.

He does concede, however, that in the future world the vision will be more perfect. It will then be "face to face."[1] And in the section of the Stromata referred to above he has a somewhat strange interpretation:

> The divine apostle writes accordingly respecting us: "For now we see through a glass"; knowing ourselves in it by reflection, and simultaneously contemplating, as we can, the efficient cause, from that which is in us divine. For it is said, "Having seen thy brother, thou hast seen thy God": methinks that now the Savior God is declared to us. But after the laying aside of the flesh, "face to face",--then definitely and comprehensively, when the heart becomes pure. And by reflection and direct vision, those among the Greeks who have philosophized accurately, see God.

Even though the vision of God may be merely a reflection, it is not in the nature of an enigma. The view may be imperfect, yet it is true:

> For such through our weakness, are our true views, as images are seen in the water, and as we see things through pellucid and transparent bodies.

Here, then, as in so many other instances, Clement is prompted to change the text for theological reasons.[2]

Example 23

Strom. ii. 5	Mark 10: 25; cf. Matt. 19: 24; Luke 18: 25
θᾶττον κάμαλον διὰ τρυπήματος βελόνης διελεύσεσθαι ἢ πλούσιον φιλοσοφεῖν.	εὐκοπώτερον ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τῆς τρυμαλιᾶς τῆς ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

The reason for the substitution of ἢ πλούσιον φιλοσοφεῖν for ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν, is well set forth by Tollinton:

> Not only will he alter tense, number, person, and the like to suit his context, he will also add words, or omit, or change, when it fits his purpose to do so. This may be made clear from one or two examples: "It is easier" he says, "for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to be a philosopher." Christianity being in Clement's

---

[1] Clement Paedagogue i. 6.

[2] For other uses of this passage cf. Clement Stromata iv. 3; v. 1. 11.

eyes the true philosophy, the last phrase is not an unnatural equivalent to write in place of the words, "enter into the kingdom of God," which stands in the Synoptic Gospels. But it is clearly an intentional variation, not a different reading.[1]

Example 24

Strom. iv. 6	Matt. 5: 10, 9
Μακάριοι, φησὶν, οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται· ἢ ὥς τινες τῶν μετατιθέντων τὰ εὐαγγέλια· Μακάριοι, φησὶν, οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ὑπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἔσονται τέλειοι· καὶ μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκα ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἔξουσι τόπον ὅπου οὐ διωχθήσονται.	Μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. Μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται.

While Clement accuses "certain people" of transposing the Gospel, he himself seems guilty of the same thing. Here, he has transposed 9b and 10b. Barnard comments that Clement had "confused these two verses; ὅτι αὐτοὶ--κληθήσονται belongs to v. 9."[2] Burkitt suggests that the blessing on the peacemakers may have "slipped into the next verse in Clement's MS."[3] In the same connection Barnard suggests that "the expression ὥς τινες τῶν μετατιθέντων τὰ εὐαγγέλια, probably refers to writers of the Apocryphal Gospels."

It will be noted that Clement does not refute the transposition of the group to which he refers. On the contrary, he quotes approvingly to the effect that the persecuted for righteousness' sake, shall be perfect. But as a matter of fact all three sanctions for enduring persecution are almost without distinction in Clement's mind. Note the sequence of the truly Christian experience:

> Being baptized we are illuminated; illuminated we become sons; being made sons we are made perfect; being made perfect we are made immortal.[4]

The distinction, then, is not an important one for this early

---

[1]Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London, 1914), II, 178.

[2]Barnard, op. cit., p. 5. [3]Ibid.

[4]Clement Paedagogue i. 6.

Christian writer. It is almost altogether a matter of the choice of terminology rather than of ideas.

Furthermore, how this ties in with the matter of persecution can be shown. Clement describes the perfect man:

> Here I find perfection apprehended variously in relation to Him who excels in every virtue. Accordingly one is perfected as pious, and as patient, and as continent, and as a worker, and as a martyr, and as a Gnostic . . . . . And if he conduct himself rightly . . . .; and if, further, having made an eminently right confession, he become a martyr out of love, obtaining considerable renown as among men; not even thus will he be called perfect in the flesh beforehand; since it is the close of life that claims this appellation, when the gnostic martyr has first shown the perfect work, and rightly exhibited it, and having thankfully shed his blood, has yielded up the ghost; blessed then will he be, and truly proclaimed perfect.[1]

As for the Beatitude, Μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκα ἐμοῦ ὅτι ἔξουσι τόπον ὅπου οὐ διωχθήσονται , it is easy to understand how this word of hope and comfort would arise in a time of persecution or when persecution was threatening. It seems to have as its background Matthew 5: 11, 12 or Luke 6: 22, 23, where heaven is held out as a reward for enduring persecution for Jesus' sake.

Example 25

Strom. v. 10	Col. 1: 28
νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ. οὐ πάντα ἁπλῶς ἄνθρωπον, ἔπει οὐδεὶς ἂν ἦν ἄπιστος, οὐ δὲ μὴν πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ, ἀλλὰ πάντα ἄνθρωπον λέγει, ὡς εἰπεῖν ὅλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οἷον σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ ἡγνισμένον . . . . .[2]	νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ.

The above quotation from the Stromata is not in its entirety a passage from Colossians. The quotation proper is fairly

---

[1] Clement Stromata iv. 21.

[2] L, 424, 460, 1908, Eúthal. and some others omit και διδασκοντες παντα ανθρωπον. Strom. i. 1, D, E, F, G, 0142, 32, 33, 76, 234, 326, 327, d, e, f, g, aeth. Ambrst. omit παντα ανθρωπον. Το σοφια F, G, d, e, f, g add πνευματικη.

well in agreement with the New Testament passage although καὶ διδάσκοντες is omitted. The point of interest, however, lies in Clement's interpretation of πάντα ἄνθρωπον. While he does not change the text in this instance, we have before our eyes an example of his reasoning when using passages which presented him with doctrinal difficulties. It is clear that πάντα ἄνθρωπον in its original context simply means "every man." But Clement, unable to concede that every man may find perfection, insists that πάντα ἄνθρωπον has the sense of ὅλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον, "the whole man." It may be significant that some manuscripts omit πάντα ἄνθρωπον altogether.

The omission of καὶ διδάσκοντες may also have some significance for our purpose. That Clement knew the common reading is shown by its use elsewhere.[1] It is quite likely that he would hesitate to affirm that all men should be taught wisdom. As a matter of fact, our context teaches the very opposite notion. He quotes Hebrews to the effect that "ye have again need that one teach you which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not solid food. . . . ." He then quotes "Isaiah when he says 'who shall understand the Lord's parable but the wise and understanding, and he that loves his Lord?' It is but for few to comprehend these things." Again he says: "It is the teacher only who uncovers the lid of the ark," and quotes Paul: "Howbeit we speak wisdom among them who are perfect." How, then, could he quote words signifying the very opposite meaning without an elaborate interpretation?

Example 26

Strom. v. 12	John 1: 18
θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.[2]	θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

---

[1] Stromata i. 1.

[2] q has filius dei. Eusebius: θεον--ο μονογενης υιος η μονογενης θεος ο ων εις . . . .
Athenasius: ο μεντοι υιος κατα τον ιω. θεος ουχ απλως, αλλ αληθινος θεος εστι. και γαρ κατα τον αυτον τουτον· και θεος

This is a reading most disconcerting to those who wish to find the text used by Clement consistently "Western" in character. In this instance he is at variance with the western manuscripts and agrees with $^{c}33$ and the Bohairic, in reading ὁ μονογενὴς θεὸς.

It is important to notice that Clement knows the reading ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς .[1] The least, therefore, that can be said is that he deliberately chose the reading ὁ μονογενὴς θεὸς, although it may have been in manuscripts current at the time. It will be observed that he does not use ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς in actual quotations, merely in allusions. This may, of course, mean that the actual text before him had ὁ μονογενὴς θεὸς, but this conclusion is not an absolute necessity.

The fact that he uses ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς in an allusion would point to a knowledge of that reading. In any case, it is most probable that the earliest reading was ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς and that for doctrinal reasons it was changed to ὁ μονογενὴς θεὸς. Since the trend was toward a higher Christology the reverse process is less likely to have taken place. Clement may not have been responsible for the change in the first instance, but he was part of the process that strengthened its place in the text. His doctrine of the Logos shows how completely at home this reading was in his theology. We quote Tollinton:

> To begin with the divine Unity. The Logos is God. Not only does he derive His being from the absolute Deity, but he is himself intrinsically God. The term θεός is applied frequently to his person, nor is his claim to the title abandoned even in the lowest actions of His incarnate life. When He draws near to man as Savior, when He becomes the all-satisfying possession of our human nature, when His activity

---

ην ο λογος. ελεγε τε ο υιος· εγω ειμι η ζωη· ουκουν ο υιος λογος εστιν και ζωη η ουσα τω πατρι. παλιν δε το εν αυτω τω ιω. ειρημενον· ο μονογενης υιος ο ων εις--πατρος, δεικνυσι τον υιον αει ειναι. ου γαρ λεγει ο ιω. υιον, τουτον χειρα ο δαυιδ.
Basil: οι δε γαρ το ονομα το υπερ παν ονομα του υιου και υιον αληθινον λεγειν και μονογενη θεον και δυναμιν θεου . . . .
Epiphanius: αξιοπιστος δε μαρτυς ο επι το στηθος αυτου αναπεσων, μονογενης θεον αυτον φασκων.

Also, και φησιν ο μονογενης θεος· ο μεν γαρ λογος εστιν εκ πατρος γεννηθεις, ο πατηρ δε ουκ εγεννηθη δια τουτο μονογενης υιος.
Cyril: αυτος γαρ ων θεος ο μονογενης . . . .
Aleph, B, C, L, 33, cop. syr.^{sch} aeth.: μονογενης θεος.
Origen: και μονογενης γε ων θεος ο ων . . . .

[1] Clement Stromata 1. 26.

> is discerned in historic and mundane events, He is still described by Clement in language which denotes the fullest measure of divine being. He is still ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς λόγος.[1]

Tollinton goes on to show the essential unity of God and the Logos by quoting words which, he thinks, have particular force in the original language: ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἐν ταὐτότητι λόγον θεὸν ἐν θεῷ φημεν, ὃς καὶ εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι λέγεται, ἀδιάστατος, ἀμέριστος, εἷς θεός.[2]

Barnard says that the evidence points to the fact that Clement's usual reading was ὁ μονογενὴς θεὸς, but that he knew the variant ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς.[3] Tollinton is not so sure that this was Clement's usual reading. He points out that ὁ μονογενὴς θεὸς is used three times out of five, but decides that the evidence is inconclusive:

> Both readings were evidently well known to Clement, and both find support in his theology.[4]

Example 27

Strom. vi. 7	Matt. 23: 8, 9
μὴ εἴπητε ἑαυτοῖς διδάσκαλον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.	ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ κληθῆτε ῥαββεί· εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος, πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς ἀδελφοί ἐστε. καὶ πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

It will be observed that Clement's reading does not appear in the New Testament passage.[5] He has "call no man your teacher on earth" whereas Matthew has "call no man your father upon the earth." The reference to "teacher" appears, however, in verse 8: "One is your teacher." Clement knows the common reading as is

---

[1]Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London, 1914), I, 342 f.

[2]Ibid., p. 344. The quotation is from Clement, Excerpta ex Theodoto 8. Cf. in the same work: 6, 7; also Q.D.S. 37.

[3]Barnard, op. cit., p. 54.

[4]Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London, 1914), II, 189.

[5]Cf. Clement Stromata iii.12; Eclogae 20; Q.D.S. 23.

shown by its use elsewhere.[1] Why does he substitute "teacher" in the present connection? The context of the quotation may shed some light upon the matter:

> And we also have heard that angels learned the truth, and their rulers over them. . . . . It remains, then, for us ascending to seek their teacher. And since the unoriginated Being is one, the Omnipotent God; one, too, is the First-begotten, "by whom all things were made, and without whom not one thing ever was made." . . . . And He is called Wisdom by the prophets. This is He from above, from the first foundation of the world, "in many ways and many times", trains and perfects; whence it is rightly said, "Call no man your teacher on earth."

The trend of Clement's thought is seen. The same motivation is at work which prompted the projection of the Pedagogue. The teacher of men is the divine Logos, whose abode is in Heaven. He says further:

> The self love of the Greeks proclaims certain men as their teachers. As, then, the whole family runs back to God the Creator; so also all the teaching of good things, which justifies, does to the Lord and leads and contributes to this.[2]

The same sort of context is found in another instance where the quotation is identically the same.[3] Barnard says that the occurrence of this reading in identically the same form is "most remarkable," and compares Origen's reading: μὴ καλέσητε ὃ.[4]

Example 28

Strom. vi. 9	**Matt. 7: 7; Mark 6: 22**
Αἴτησαι, λέγων, καὶ ποιήσω ἐννοήθητι καὶ δώσω.	Αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ζητεῖτε, καὶ εὑρήσετε· κρούετε, καὶ ἀνοιγησεται ὑμῖν.
	Mark 6: 22:
	Αἴτησον με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι.

Of this quotation Resch says:

> The saying, if it is truly a quotation, calls to mind Mark 6: 22: αἴτησον με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι. On the other hand, there is no New Testament parallel to

---

[1] But compare Matthew's form: "You are not to be called , for one is your teacher" (ο διδασκαλος).

[2] Clement Stromata vi. 7.

[3] Ibid., ii. 4.

[4] Origen Homilies x. 1.

> ἔννοεῖν is frequent in Septuagint-Greek and in the Old Testament Apocrypha. Compare I Maccabees 2: 61: ουτως ἐννοήθητε. Also compare I Kings 3: 5 . . . . LXX: αἴτησαι τι αἴτημα σοι.[1]

None of the writers actually locates the quotation in any apocryphal writing. In any case it seems apparent that the above-mentioned New Testament passages form the basis for the reading given by Clement. He may have quoted it from some current apocryphal work or he may himself have been responsible for its creation. The fact, however, that he repeats it elsewhere in exactly the same form would suggest that it had achieved a fixed structure.[2] But this position is weakened by the fact that δώσω and ποιήσω are elsewhere interchanged.[3] Note also that σοι is added after δώσω.

The reason for the variant in Clement's argument is clear from the context. Prayer consists in something far deeper than the audible repetition of words:

> The Lord will not wait for the voice of this man (i.e. the Gnostic and the perfect man) in prayer. "Ask", he says, "and I will do it; think and I will give."[4]

And again,

> To those, then, who have repented and not firmly believed, God grants their requests through their supplications. But to those who live sinlessly and gnostically, He gives, when they have but merely entertained the thought. For example, to Anna, on her merely conceiving the thought, conception was vouchsafed of the child Samuel. "Ask", says the Scripture, "and I will do. Think, and I will give."[5]

And in his discussion of prayer as converse (ὁμιλία) with God he writes:

> The Gnostic from his exceeding holiness, is better prepared to fail when he asks, than to get when he does not ask.
>
> His whole life is prayer and converse with God. And if he be pure from sins, he will by all means obtain what he wishes. For God says to the righteous man, "Ask, and I will give thee; think and I will do."

From statements of this nature Tollinton writes:

> He (the Gnostic) will pray aloud, sharing the common petitions of the faithful, which are the true incense, "composed of many tonges and voices"; or preferably he will pray

---

[1] Alfred Resch, Agrapha (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), p. 303.

[2] Clement Stromata vii. 12. 790.

[3] Ibid., vii. 12. 876.

[4] Ibid., vi. 9.

[5] Ibid., vi. 12.

silently, without utterence, speaking in the heart to God. He is familiar with the paradox involved in prayer that, although God knows our wants before they are uttered, and gives, unasked, every good gift to those who are fit to receive it; still prayer, even in the sense of petition, is right and has its use and function in the spiritual economy. In one passage Clement makes the illuminating suggestion that prayer is a return of Providence upon itself, the human will being so identified with the divine that God receives back the suggestion of His own purpose from ourselves.[1]

Example 29

Strom. vii. 12	Luke 14: 26, 27
Ἐὰν μὴ μισήσητε τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα προσέτι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ψυχὴν, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ τὸ σημεῖον βαστάσητε	Εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρός με καὶ οὐ μισεῖ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα, καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, καὶ τὰς ἀδελφάς, ἔτι δε καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν, οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής, ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής.

It is noticeable that the Cross does not form a conspicuous part of the teaching of Clement. And even in this connection we find not so much a reference to the Cross, as to the fact of submission to and initiation in the Christian faith. The "sign" undoubtedly refers to the sign of the cross. Tollinton has pointed out that

> the baptized person received the blessed seal, by which Clement no doubt meant, like Tertullian, the sign of the Cross. "To bear the sign", or "to bear about the stigma of Christ", are expressions applicable to those who have received Baptism. The "Seal" is specially connected with the name of the Trinity. It appears that the threefold invocation was made both at the immersion and again later, when the sign of the Cross was imposed.[2]

Says Clement:

> "To bear the sign" is to bear about death, by taking farewell of all things while still alive; since there is not equal love in "having sown the flesh", and in having formed the soul for knowledge.

---

[1] Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London, 1914), II, 92 f.

[2] Ibid., p. 140.

This change in the New Testament passage arises out of the contemporary Christian practice of bestowing the signs of the Cross on the initiate.

Something of the background of this "sign of the cross" is provided by the early Christians themselves. In certain of the apocryphal Acts there is expounded a doctrine which attributed a cosmical significance to the Cross of Christ.[1] In the Acts of John the picture is drawn of the appearance of Christ to the Apostle John who had taken refuge in a cave on the mount of Olives. The crucifixion had taken place and darkness covered the earth. Then Christ appeared to John. The account runs:

> My lord stood in the midst of the cave and illumined it and said: "John, unto the multitude down below in Jerusalem I am being crucified and pricked with lances and reeds, and vinegar and gall are given me to drink; but unto thee I am speaking, and do thou hearken to what I say. . . . . And having thus spoken, He showed me a cross of light securely fixed and around the cross a great multitude. . . . . And I beheld the Lord himself upon the cross, and He had no form but only a voice strange to listen to, a voice sweet, kindly and truly divine, which said to me: One must hear this from Me, for I am in need of one to hear it. This cross of light I call for your sakes sometimes Logos, sometimes Understanding, sometimes Jesus, sometimes Christ, sometimes Door, sometimes Way, sometimes Bread, sometimes Seed, sometimes Resurrection, sometimes Son, sometimes Father, sometimes Spirit, sometimes Life, sometimes Truth, sometimes Grace. So it is called for men. But in reality, regarded in itself and according to our manner of speaking, it is that which fixes the limits of all things and the sure uplifting of that which from being unstable has been made steadfast. . . . .[2]

Findlay regards this doctrine of the cross as having a two-fold purpose: (1) to get rid of the offence of the cross, and (2) to give it some great place in the universal scheme of things.[3] He suggests that the doctrine has a vital relation to the Platonic notion of the world soul. This world soul, in the Platonic literature, is conceived as being divided lengthwise into two parts. The two parts were joined together at the center, cross-like, to form the letter Chi (X).[4] This was referred to the two great heavenly circles, the equator and the eliptic, which cut one another at the equinoctial points. The result is a great Chi in

---

[1]The Acts of John, chap. 19; The Acts of Peter, chaps. 37 ff.

[2]Findlay, op. cit., pp. 229 f.

[3]Ibid., p. 230.

[4]Plato Timaeus 36.

heaven.

So, says Findlay,

> when cosmical significance came to be attached to Christ, as we find it in Col. 1: 16 f., Heb. 1: 3, and the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, it was natural that those familiar with Greek philosophy should have identified Him with the all-pervasive soul of the world. And just as naturally the Cross of Christ came to be regarded as the appearance on earth of the great X of the world-soul in heaven. This may strike us as sheer mythological trifling with the supreme fact of Christian history, but it was the kind of speculation which appealed, not to Gnostics merely, but to orthodox ecclesiastical writers in the second century. Justin . . . . made the double identification to which reference has been made (Apol. i. 60), and in particular Irenaeus (Epideixis, ch. 34) has a passage which is intelligible only when we recognize that the Divine Word through whom all things were created was in his view the same as the Platonic anima mundi.[1]

The passage from the Apology runs, in part, as follows:

> And the physiological discussion concerning the Son of God in the Timaeus of Plato, where he says, "He placed him crosswise in the universe," he borrowed . . . . from Moses; for in the writings of Moses it is related . . . . that Moses, by the inspiration and influence of God, took brass, and made it into the figure of a cross . . . . and said to the people, "If you look to this figure, and believe, you shall be saved thereby". . . . . Which things Plato reading, and not accurately understanding, and not apprehending that it was a figure of the cross, but taking it to be a placing crosswise, he said that the power next to the first God was placed crosswise in the universe.[2]

The most significant statement comes from Irenaeus and leads to the type of experience reflected in the quotation under consideration:

> He (who through the obedience of the Cross destroyed on the tree the old disobedience) is Himself the Word of Almighty God who permeates us all in the immediate present, and accordingly He embraces the whole world, its breadth and length, its height and depth; for through the Word of God were all things set in order, and God's son is crucified in them, in that He is stamped on all in the form of a cross.[3]

Example 30

Q.D.S. 38 (956)	I Cor. 13: 8
Ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε ἐκπίπτει, προφητεῖαι καταργοῦνται,	Ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε πίπτει· εἴτε δὲ προφητεῖαι, καταργηθήσονται·

---

[1] Findlay, op. cit., p. 231. [2] Justin Apology i. 60.

[3] Cited in Findlay, op. cit., p. 231.

γλῶσσαι παύονται, ἴάσεις ἐπὶ γῆς καταλείπονται.

εἴτε γλῶσσαι, παύσονται· εἴτε γνῶσις καταργηθήσεται.

This seems to be an excellent illustration of variation due to a clear motive at work. Clement refuses to say that knowledge shall vanish away. So he substitutes the phrase, "Cures are left behind on earth."[1] Tollinton, writing of Clement's willingness deliberately to change Scriptural passages to suit his context, says,

> So, in quoting I Cor. 13: 8 he substitutes for "whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away," the words "cures are left behind on earth." Not even Saint Paul's authority will induce Clement to say that knowledge, Gnosis, shall vanish away. He would rather risk giving offence to the whole medical College of Alexandria, of whom many perhaps were his personal friends. So the text of Saint Paul is adapted accordingly.[2]

Instances of Dogmatic Variation

Class B

Example 1

Ap. i. 15. 9	Luke 6: 27, 28
Εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς καὶ εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν καὶ εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.	Ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς. Εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.

The combination εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν is found in the Dialogue with Trypho (133), in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies 3. 19, in the Didascalia 5, and in the Didache 1, although in varying forms. Bousset thinks that this proves a text in which

---

[1] Origen 4. 220: γνωσις η εκ μερους, ητις καταργηθησεται οταν ελθη . . . ; Dam: ποια γνωσις καταργειται; η μερικη. There is no apparent reason why Clement should have substituted "cures" for "gnosis" unless there would be a similarity in appearance when ιασεις and γνωσις are written in uncials. The context does not help.

[2] Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London, 1914), II, 178.

the reading εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν was the accepted form.[1] It may be, however, that Justin preferred this form in his discussion or he may not have been familiar with the traditional reading ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν.

If he used it deliberately, why did he do so? The following very tentative suggestion is made. It should be remembered that Justin addresses the Apology to the head of the Roman state, even if it was not intended directly for his observation. It will also be recalled how completely the Romans coveted divine assistance for the state. The main function of religion as conceived by the Romans was not to render worship to the gods but to "insure divine protection for society."[2] This being the case, it may have some bearing on the items included in the discussion.

In chapter 6, Justin refutes the charge that the Christians are atheists. He insists that the Christians worship the "most true God, the father of righteousness and the other virtues, who is free from all impurity." He can now claim that the Christians not only follow the only God worthy the name, but that they invoke his blessing on their enemies. Indeed, Jesus their Master commanded that very thing. In this connection it may be pointed out that in chapter 65 the initiate prays with the Christians "that we may be counted worthy . . . . by our works also to be found good citizens." Did the prayers include one on behalf of the emperor? Probably so. The phrase, "and for all others in every place," would imply this taken in conjunction with the reference to good citizens. Having these facts in mind, the reading, εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν takes on a new significance. It grows out of very practical considerations which were to have increasing significance in the following centuries.

The discussion of Westcott respecting this quotation may prove of value in the context of this study. He cites it as showing "the process by which these various readings were stereotyped." The argument is quoted in full:

> Prayer for enemies may well seem the most noble characteristic of Christian morality. "Christ taught us to pray for our enemies, saying, Be ye kind and merciful, even as is your

---

[1] Bousset, op. cit., p. 75.

[2] S. J. Case, The Social Triumph of the Ancient Church (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1933), p. 161.

heavenly Father." "We who used to hate one another . . . . now pray for our enemies . . . . ." The phrase as well as the idea was fixed in Justin's mind; and is it then strange that he quotes our Lord's teaching on the love of enemies elsewhere in this form: Pray for your enemies, and love them that hate you, and bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you?[1] The repetition of the key-word pray points to the origin of the change; and the form and context of the quotation show that it was not made directly from any written source. But here, again there are considerable variations in the readings of the passage. In St. Matthew it should stand thus: Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you. The remaining clauses seem to have been interpolated from St. Luke. Origen quotes the text in this shorter form five times; and in the two remaining quotations he only substitutes them that despitefully use you from St. Luke for them that persecute you in the last clause. Irenaeus gives the precept in another shape: "Love your enemies, and pray for them that hate you". Still more in accordance with Justin's citations Tertullian says, "It is enjoined on us to pray to God for our enemies, and to bless our persecutors."[2]

It may be that no fault should be found with this interpretation of the origin of the reading. But even if we grant this it still remains true that prayer for enemies and persecutors has reference to Justin's particular purpose: He is interested in showing, as Westcott intimates, the "most noble characteristic of Christian morality." The only question is as to whether he has in mind the particular matter and source of persecution--the emperor and the Roman state.

Example 2

Ap. 1. 16. 11	Matt. 7: 22; cf. Luke 13: 26
Κύριε, κύριε οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ δυνάμεις ἐποιήσαμεν;	Κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν;
	Luke 13: 26:
	Ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας.

There are two factors of interest before us here. The first has to do with the phrase "eating and drinking." Bousset's discussion of this is of real value. He points out, to begin

---

[1]Justin Apology i. 15. [2]Westcott, op. cit., p. 127.

with, that Justin uses it again in his Dialogue, although, as will be noted later, there is an important difference between the two. The quotation in the Dialogue runs as follows:

> Πολλοὶ ἐροῦσε μοι τῇ ἡμερᾳ ἐκείνῃ κύριε, κύριε οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐφάγομεν καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ προεφητεύσαμεν καὶ δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν.

It is to be noted that the reading is a mixture of Matthew and Luke. The Lukan phrase, "eating and drinking" is removed entirely from its original context. It is found in many writings of the ancient church fathers. Bousset concludes that it is a variant of the western text inasmuch as it is found in the Curetonian Syriac, in the quotations of Hieronymous and Augustine, and probably in the Italian manuscripts. This variant, he says, disappeared very early from the manuscripts. It probably got its rise from the early food controversy, and constituted a protest against the rapid development of Gentile Christianity.[1]

The above may be the correct explanation of the origin of the variant. Justin may have used it simply because it was the form familiar to him. At any rate, I can see no reason why Justin should use one form here in preference to another. But another change in the quotation does appear significant. I refer to the reading καὶ δυνάμεις ἐποιήσαμεν which leaves out the reference to the specific act of casting out demons. This omission is significant because Justin is aware of the full quotation. He uses it in the Dialogue as has been noted above. Why, then, does he omit it here? The answer is close at hand. Justin is on his guard against saying anything in the Apology which might suggest magic.[2] In the Dialogue, however, he need not resort to this caution since, ostensibly, he is addressing a Jew.

It is interesting to note how the whole argument of the Apology is raised above the level of magic. The phrase δυνάμεις ἐποιήσαμεν in this treatise refers more properly to the various ways in which Jesus fulfilled the predictions of Scripture.[3]

---

[1] Bousset, op. cit., pp. 92 f. Origen has ου τω ονοματι σου εφαγομεν και τω ονοματι σου επιομεν και τω ονοματι σου δαιμονια εξεβαλομεν και δυναμεις πολλας εποιησαμεν; similarly Aug. and Hier.

[2] E. C. Colwell, John Defends the Gospel (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1936), chap. ii.

[3] Justin Apology i. 22 ff.

Example 3

Ap. i. 63. 3	Matt. 11: 27; cf. Luke 10: 22
Οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ οἷς ἂν ἀποκαλύψῃ ὁ υἱός.[1]	Καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

The transposition of ideas as is evident from the above is widespread in the writings of the church fathers. It should be observed that Matthew and Luke agree in the order of the clauses. Concerning Justin's use of it in the Apology it may be said that his choice of order is obviously determined by his argument. He is attempting to show that Jesus charged the Jews with ignorance of God. The order of the Gospels would weaken the force of the argument. In the Gospels the situation is entirely different. In Matthew, the whole context is unbelief with respect to Jesus, not God. In that context Matthew's phrasing, "No one knoweth the Son save the Father neither doth any know the Father save the Son," is most appropriate.

Kaye calls it "an evident quotation by memory from Matthew 11: 27."[2] It may be argued that the widespread use of a very similar rendering makes the notion of a peculiar source quite tenable. Especially is this the case in view of the fact that Irenaeus[3] quotes the passage from the Gospels used by the Marcosians in a very similar form. But whether this Gospel was orthodox or heretical is unknown. The passage was quoted in almost every conceivable way in early times. It would seem likely, in view of

---

[1]Cf. Irenaeus Against Heresies iv. 6: "'No man knoweth the Son, but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and He to whom the Son has willed to reveal Him.' Thus hath Matthew set it down, and Luke in like manner, and Mark the very same; for John omits the passage. They, however, who would be wiser than the apostles, write in the following manner: 'No man knew the Father, but the Son; nor the Son, but the Father, and he to whom the Son has willed to reveal Him'; and they explain it as if the true God were known to none prior to our Lord's advent; and that God who was announced by the prophets, they allege not to be the Father of Christ."

[2]John Kaye, Apology of Justin Martyr (Edinburgh: J. Grant, 1912), p. 101.

[3]Irenaeus Against Heresies i. 20. 3.

the subject matter, that it would provide significant material, by a shift of emphasis, for either Gnostic or anti-Gnostic circles.

Westcott has the following suggestion:

> If indeed Justin's quotations were made from memory, no transposition could be more natural.[1]

He also points out that Semish suggested that the word immediately preceding may have led to the transposition.

The passage with the same transposition is also found in the Dialogue, and in quite a different context.[2] But in this connection we may again bring in the witness of Westcott:

> . . . . a false quotation may appear a tradition. Much more is it likely to reappear from association in a writer to whom it once occurred by accident, or been suggested by peculiar influences.[3]

Example 4

Dial. 76. 5	Matt. 25: 41
Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, ὃ ἡτοίμησεν ὁ πατὴρ τῷ σατανᾷ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.	Πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ κατηραμένοι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἡτοιμασμένοι τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.

The variant that concerns us here is the use of τῷ σατανᾷ instead of τῷ διαβόλῳ. On the face of it there is little in the substitution of significance. But in the light of Justin's discussion of the title "Satan" in chapter 103, it may at least illustrate the sort of thing that was done.

It is of interest to note that the author of the Clementine Homilies has the same changes in quotation with the exception of διαβόλῳ which he retains.[4] Purves has seen this, and has drawn attention to precisely the point made here, that his knowledge of Jesus' use of the term "Satan" was sufficient to account for the change from διαβόλῳ. Purves' statement is as follows:

> Justin substitutes ὑπάγετε for πορεύεσθε ; τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον for τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον; ὃ ἡτοιμασεν ὁ πατήρ for τὸ ἡτοιμασαμένον; and τὸ σατανᾷ for τῷ διαβόλῳ. So the Homilist except that he retains διαβόλῳ. But both ὑπάγετε and ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ πατήρ have ancient western manuscript authority for them in Matthew, while τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον

---

[1] Westcott, op. cit., pp. 120 f. [2] Justin Dialogue 100.

[3] Westcott, op. cit., p. 137. [4] Clementine Homilies 12. 2.

> is not without later attestation by confusion with, e.g. Matt. 5: 30, and was an easy error. Textual corruption, therefore, will account for the texts both of Justin and the Homilist. In Dialogue 103 Justin says the devil was called Satan by Christ; hence perhaps, his introduction of the word here.[1]

A careful reading of chapter 103 shows how sincere Justin was in his discussion of this name. Jesus has recognized that the name Satan has functional significance which the term "devil" does not suggest:

> Whom Moses calls the serpent, but in Job and Zechariah he is called the devil, and by Jesus is addressed as Satan, showing that a compound name (Sata Nas) was acquired by him from the deeds which he performed.

This idea would be sufficient to induce him to change from σατανᾷ to διαβόλῳ, in the passage under consideration.

Example 5

Dial. 100. 5	Luke 1: 35
Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπελεύσεται καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει αὐτήν, διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἐξ αὐτῆς ἅγιον ἐστιν υἱὸς θεοῦ.	Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ.

Justin omits κληθήσεται from the quotation. So also does the Protevangelium of James. In place of κληθήσεται Justin puts ἐστιν. The explanation may be that since the event has already taken place Justin feels the future form of the verb to be out of place. Or it may be that κληθήσεται would introduce an element of uncertainty into the discussion.[2] Jesus, begotten of Mary, should not simply be <u>called</u> holy. He is in fact holy.

---

[1] Purves, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 207.

[2] Cf. Justin <u>Dialogue</u> 17. 13 where κληθησεται is omitted from the quotation, "My house shall be called a house of prayer but you have made it a den of thieves." Instead, Justin gives the following: ο οικος μου οικος προσευχης εστιν, υμεις δε πεποιηκατε αυτον σπηλαιον ληστων. The same motivation seems to be present. The matter is a present and certain fact. Syr. Cur. adds <u>omnibus gentibus</u> to προσευχης.

Example 6

Paed. i. 5	Matt. 23: 8
Εἷς διδάσκαλος ἐν οὐρανοῖς.[1]	Εἷς γὰρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος.

The addition ἐν οὐρανοῖς may have special significance. It is necessary only to quote the words of Hermann Kutter:

> It also frequently happens that Clement, limited by the thoughts and words of his own speculation, restores the quotation in their colors. So, for example, in the Paedagogue I 5, 17 where Clement gives the words of Jesus to his disciples, εἷς γὰρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν διδάσκαλος, in the following form: εἷς γὰρ διδάσκαλος ἐν οὐρανοῖς. In his context, Clement has given a special importance to οὐρανοί. When he says εἰ δέ εἷς διδάσκαλος ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὥς φησιν ἡ γραφὴ ὁμολογουμένους οἱ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰκοτως ἂν πάντες κληθήσονται μαθηταί, ἐπὶ γῆς is evidently meant to be contrasted with οὐρανοί. This contrast is Clement's chief concern.[2]

Example 7

Paed. iii. 8	Jude 6; cf. II Pet. 2: 6
. . . . ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀΐδιοις ὑπὸ-ζόφον ἀγρίων ἀγγέλων τετήρηκεν.	Ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόν-τας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀΐδίοις ὑπὸζόφον τετήρηκεν.

Clement's quotation of this passage from Jude is so accurate that the addition of ἀγρίων ἀγγέλων stands out prominently. The many references to the function of the angels in the various works of Clement indicate that he had a firm belief in them as functionary beings. It is too bad that we do not have his systematic statement on the subject such as he intended to project.[3] In any case he believed in the existence of both good and evil

---

[1] Origen 3. 182: και υμεις μη καλεσητε διδασκαλον επι της γης· εις γαρ εστιν υμων ο διδασκ. ο πατηρ ο εν τοις ουρ.

[2] Kutter, op. cit., p. 33.

[3] Clement Stromata vi. 3. Cf. m and Lcif: in indicium magni dei vinculis eos sanctorum angelorum sub tenebras reservabit (Lcif: servait).

angels:

> Phocylides, who calls the angels demons, explains in the following words that some of them are good, and others bad. . . . . "Demons there are--some here, some there--set over men; some, on man's entrance to ward off ill."[1]

Again,

> And some say that plagues and hailstones, and tempests, and the like, are wont to take place, not alone in consequence of material disturbance, but also through anger of demons and bad angels.[2]

Further,

> He (the Gnostic) will pray that he may never fall from virtue; giving his most strenuous cooperation in order that he may become infallible. For he knows that some of the angels, through carelessness, were hurled to the earth, not having yet quite reached that state of oneness, by extricating themselves from the propensity to that duality.[3]

The specific allusion is, of course, to Genesis 6. The quotation from Jude is used to show how punishment varies with different sins:

> For those who have not committed like sins with those who are punished, will never receive a like punishment. By guarding against sinning, we guard against suffering.

Then follows the quotation.

Whatever may have been the exact thought lying behind the reference to the "savage angels," it is clear that it finds its explanation in the background of the author's angelology. It may well be that there is back of it some bit of folk-tale which related these "savage angels" to be the guardians of the fallen "sons of God" of Genesis 6.

Example 8

Paed. iii. 12	Luke 10: 28
Τοῦτο ποίει, καὶ σωθήσῃ.[4]	Τοῦτο ποίει, καὶ ζήσῃ.

In the change from ζήσῃ to σωθήσῃ Clement differs from all known texts. The change might easily be made in view of the

---

[1] Clement Stromata v. 14.

[2] Ibid., vi. 2. [3] Ibid., vii. 7.

[4] Tischendorf says that several MSS have σωζῃ but does not name them. D has ζησεις.

fact that in Luke 18: 26, Matthew 19: 25, and Mark 10: 26 the query is advanced: "Who, then, can be saved?" The context of the Gospels, in its use of σωθῆναι, might have influenced Clement in his use of the quotation.

But there is the further possibility that the author hesitated to use ζήσῃ in the context under consideration. This takes us back to the various stages in his notion of the Higher Life. In the present context he is writing about "doing" certain things. The Paedagogue, itself, is given over to specific instructions. But important as these things may be they do not insure the Summum Bonum of religious experience. An individual may be saved but there are degrees in attainment after salvation has been achieved. The man who is baptized and thereby illuminated is saved. Nevertheless, he may yet have a long journey before he realizes the Beatific Vision. Hence, he may stress doing things as necessary for salvation, but life (ζωή), involves contemplation as well. Tollinton may again be cited on this point:

> The range of Gnosis stretches far beyond the domain of elementary instruction, and the "perfection" which is potentially ours in Baptism, must be kept carefully distinct from the realized attainment of the Higher Way. . . . . Our first inclination toward salvation is not its full possession . . . .[1]

The substitution made here by Clement is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that the question has to do with eternal life:

> Further, to him that asked, "What good thing shall I do, that I may inherit eternal life?" He answered, "Thou knowest the commandments?" And on him replying Yea, He said, "This do and Thou shalt be saved."

In harmony with what has already been suggested, however, it seems probable to me that Clement would not want to suggest that "life" in the Johannine sense or in the sense that Clement conceived of the Higher Way resulted from merely doing the commandments. But the achievement of a stage of salvation would be entirely acceptable.

Example 9

Strom. 1. 10	I Cor. 8: 3
Εἴ τις ἀγαπᾷ, οὗτος ἔγνωσται.	Εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος

---

[1] Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London, 1914), II, 78.

ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.[1]

Clement omits τὸν θεόν and ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, that is, he does make God the particular object of one's love; neither is the individual known by him.

The quotation occurs in the chapter in which is given a warning against certain types of philosophy. The Christian must "prove all things and hold fast that which is good." And "the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power," which power Clement interprets as "truth." The emphasis is on the true philosophy as over against the false. At the heart of the true philosophy, which is Christianity, is love. A man is known by his life of love. This is the generalization that ensues by virtue of the omission, and meets the need of Clement's argument.

Example 10

Strom. ii. 5	John 8: 34
Πᾶς μὲν οὖν ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν δοῦλός ἐστιν.	Πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν δοῦλός ἐστιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

The omission of τῆς ἁμαρτίας is the point of interest here. The quotation occurs again in the Stromata: Πᾶς γὰρ, φασὶν, ὁ ἁμαρτάνων δοῦλος ἐστιν.[2] It should be noted that the words τῆς ἁμαρτίας are omitted by D, b, Cyp^{274} as well as syr. sin. Barnard compares this omission to another in Cyp^{310} and syr. sin. where these agree in quoting John 11: 25: "I am the Resurrection," but omit "and the Life."[3]

Then there is the further consideration that Clement is showing in the immediate context that

> it is not the diminishing of one's resources, but the augmenting of insatiableness, that is to be considered poverty; for it is not slender means that constitutes poverty, but insatiableness, from which the good man being free, will also be rich.

He has in mind not the being a slave to some particular thing (as, for example, sin), but the slavish characteristic of servility:

---

[1] Aleph*, 33 also omit υπ αυτου.

[2] Clement Stromata iii. 4.

[3] Barnard, op. cit., p. xv.

> And in Alcibiades he (i.e. Plato) calls vice a servile thing, and virtue the attribute of freemen. "Take away from you the heavy yoke, and take up the easy one", says the Scripture; as also the poets call (vice) a slavish yoke. And the expression "Ye have sold yourselves to your sins", agrees with what is said above: Every one, then who committeth sin is a slave, and the slave abideth not in the house forever. But if the Son shall make you free, then shall ye be free, and the truth shall make you free.

The emphasis on the attribute of servility may have been an influencing factor here. As the quotation stands with the omission it could be paraphrased thus: Every one who commits sin has the characteristics of the slave. This is what Clement is in effect saying of the one given to wrong doing.

Example 11

Strom. v. 3	I Cor. 9: 22
Τοῖς γὰρ πᾶσιν πάντα ἐγενόμην ἵνα τοὺς πάντας κερδήσω.	Τοῖς πᾶσιν γέγονα πάντα, ἵνα πάντως τινὰς σώσω.

Many of the ancient manuscripts including D have πάντας. Many also of the ancient fathers including Origen and Tertullian have κερδήσω. It may be doubted that this is to be classed as an intentional variation. However, it should be remembered that in spite of Clement's emphasis on a somewhat exclusive "gnosis," he also held that the multitude might be admitted to the lower levels of experience. While a "philosophic crowd" is impossible, there is nevertheless a place for the "babes" within the church. This distinction is reflected in the context under consideration:

> "Many rod-bearers there are, but few Bacchi," according to Plato. "For many are called but few chosen." "Knowledge is not in all," says the apostle. . . . . And that our tenets are probable and worthy of belief, the Greeks shall know, the point being more thoroughly investigated in what follows. For we are taught what is like by what is like. For says Solomon, "Answer a fool according to his folly. Wherefore also, to those that ask the wisdom that is with us, we are to hold out things suitable, that with the greatest possible ease they may, through their own ideas, be likely to arrive at faith in the truth. For "I became all things to all men, that I might gain all men." Since also "the rain of the divine grace is sent down on the just and the unjust." "Is he the God of the Jews only, and not also of the Gentiles? Yes also of the Gentiles: if indeed He is one God," exclaims the noble apostle.

Paul could think of some as achieving salvation. Clement would agree with this. He could have used the phrase πάντως τινὰς σώσω. But with τοὺς πάντας he had to use some other word (in this case κερδήσω), for the Gnostic salvation was not possible to all.[1]

Example 12

Strom. vii. 11	Eph. 4: 13
. . . . φίλον, ὁμοῦ καὶ υἱὸν τὸν γνωστικὸν ἀπεργάζεται, τέλειον ὡς ἀληθῶς ἄνδρα εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας αὐξήσαντα.	Μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Clement here omits τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.[2] The same omission takes place in chapter 14 of Book vii of the Stromata. It is quite plausible that the omission was intentional, and that it grew out of the conviction that advanced as the Gnostic experience may have been it could not measure up to the fulness of Christ. The time would come when this would be the case. Hence in another place when he is anticipating that time he can include the entire quotation. He has been speaking of the "preparatory exercises" of gnostic discipline. He continues:

> And since the omnipotent God Himself "gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we attain to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." We are then to strive to reach manhood as befits the Gnostic, and to be as perfect as we can while still abiding in the flesh, making it our study with perfect concord here to concur with the will of God, to the restoration of what is the truly perfect nobleness and relationship, to the fulness of Christ, that which perfectly depends on our perfection.[3]

The achievement, then, of the fulness of Christ is at the end of

---

[1] For σωσω, Or. 3. 294; 4. 35; Naz. (Matt. 19: 1), Mac. 210, Chr. 9. 366, Thphyl. Tert. Ethiopic. Armenien have κερδησω.

[2] Note also that Clement omits τοῦ υἱοῦ as does F, G, g, Lcif.

[3] Clement Stromata iv. 21.

the process. But in the context of the passage under discussion Clement seems to have a stage of the development in mind:

> For having become wholly spiritual, and having in the spiritual Church gone to what is of kindred nature, it abides in the rest of God.

But this crowning achievement Clement knows is not achieved by all and when achieved is granted only to him who by his purity "is reckoned worthy to see God face to face."

Example 13

Strom. vii. 12	I Cor. 13: 7
Ὁ τέλειος δὲ δι' ἀγάπην στέγει, πάντα ὑπομένει	Ἡ ἀγάπη . . . . πάντα στέγει πάντα πιστεύει, πάντα ἐλπίζει, πάντα ὑπομένει.

The quotation proper probably includes only πάντα στέγει, πάντα ὑπομένει but in thought he substitutes ὁ τέλειος δὲ δι' ἀγάπην. This grows out of the consideration that for him love is the supreme characteristic of the perfect man, the true Gnostic.

This, however, is not the most significant fact in connection with the quotation. Almost invariably Clement omits πάντα πιστεύει, πάντα ἐλπίζει.[1] This omission, it seems to me, grows out of the author's Gnostic philosophy. Tollinton shows how fundamental is the concept of love in Clement's thought, so that even hope occupies a much lower place in the scale:

> Clement makes frequent reference to a trinity of predisposing forces, which assist or impel the will. These are Fear, Hope, and Love. The relative measure of their influence is in some sense a key to our spiritual attainment; for Fear, albeit a wholesome and legitimate motive, of which Clement has many commendatory things to say, is in the main the motive of the crowd, while even the Hope of the future is sometimes severely restricted to the ordinary believer. No doubt there are grades of fear, and there are hopes which can only be surrendered when they have been merged in full possession; but the distinction holds up to a point, and leaves Love as the dominant influence of the higher way.[2]

---

[1]For exceptions see Clement Paedagogue ii. 1: αγαπη . . . . παντα στεγει, παντα υπομενει, παντα ελπιζει. Also Q.D.S. 38: παντα στεγει, παντα πιστευει, παντα ελπιζει, παντα υπομενει. But even in the former of these instances παντα πιστευει is omitted.

[2]Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London, 1914), II, 80.

From this point of view it may be seen why the omission exists. Both belief and hope are irrelevant; they belong to the lower stages of development or have become "merged in full possession." "Hope," he says, "is the expectation of the possession of the good."[1] But the perfect man has already achieved its possession.

Again, in speaking of the chief end of the Gnostic Clement says:

> "The charity which bears all things, endures all things," is assured that Divine Providence orders all things well. . . . . The first step to salvation is the instruction accompanied with fear, in consequence of which we abstain from what is wrong; and the second is hope, as is fitting, perfects, by training now according to knowledge. . . . . And for those who are aiming at perfection there is proposed the rational gnosis, the foundation of which is "the sacred Triad." "Faith, hope, and love; but the greatest of these is love."[2]

---

[1]Clement Stromata ii. 6. [2]Ibid., iv. 7; cf. iv. 18.

TABLE 6

DOGMATIC VARIATIONS

Thesis Page	Patristic Literature	New Testament
	Class A	
76	Ap. i. 15. 9	Matt. 5: 46
77	Ap. i. 16. 6	Matt. 22: 37
77	Ap. i. 16. 7	Mark 10: 18
79	Dial. 77. 4	Matt. 2: 1
81	Dial. 78. 5	Luke 2: 7
85	Dial. 88. 3	Matt. 3: 15, 16; cf. Mark 1: 9, 10; Luke 3: 21, 22
88	Paed. i. 5. 12 (104)	Matt. 21: 9; cf. Mark 11: 9; Luke 19: 37, 38; John 12: 13
89	Paed. i. 5. 13 (105)	Matt. 11: 16, 17; cf. Luke 7: 32
90	Paed. i. 5. 14 (105)	Matt. 25: 33
91	Paed. i. 5. 14 (108)	Eph. 4: 13
92	Paed. i. 5. 19 (109)	I Thess. 2: 6, 7
93	Paed. i. 5. 20 (109)	Matt. 11: 27; cf. Luke 10: 22
94	Paed. i. 6. 25 (113)	Luke 3: 22; cf. Matt. 3: 17; Mark 1: 11; Ps. 2: 7
96	Paed. i. 6. 27 (114)	John 1: 3b, 4a
97	Paed. i. 6. 31 (117)	I Cor. 12: 13
97	Paed. i. 8. 62 (135)	John 1: 1
98[a]	Paed. i. 8. 72 (167)	Matt. 19: 17; cf. Mark 10: 18; Luke 18: 19
100[b]	Paed. ii. 1. 7 (167)	Matt. 4: 4
102	Paed. ii. 9. 79 (218)	John 1: 5

[a]Probably also explanatory. [b]Probably also explanatory.

TABLE 6--Continued

Thesis Page	Patristic Literature	New Testament
	Class A	
103	Paed. ii. 12. 129 (248)	I Cor. 2: 9
105	Paed. iii. 10. 53 (285)	I Pet. 2: 12
106	Strom. i. 19. 54 (348)	I Cor. 13: 12
107	Strom. ii. 5. 22 (440)	Mark 10: 25; cf. Matt. 19. 24; Luke 28: 25
108	Strom. iv. 6. 41 (581, 582)	Matt. 5: 10, 9
109	Strom. v. 10. 61 (863)	Col. 1: 28
110	Strom. v. 12. 81 (695)	John 1: 18
112	Strom. vi. 7. 58 (769)	Matt. 23: 8, 9
113	Strom. vi. 9. 78 (778)	Matt. 7: 7; Mark 6: 22
115	Strom. vii. 12. 79 (880)	Luke 14: 26, 27
117	Q.D.S 38 (956)	I Cor. 13: 8
	Class B	
118[a]	Ap. i. 15. 9	Luke 6: 27, 28
120	Ap. i. 16. 11	Matt. 7: 22; cf. Luke 13: 26
122	Ap. i. 63. 3	Matt. 11: 27; cf. Luke 10: 22
123	Dial. 76. 5	Matt. 25: 41
124	Dial. 100. 5	Luke 1: 35
125	Paed. i. 5. 17 (108)	Matt. 23: 8
125	Paed. iii. 8. 44 (280)	Jude 6; cf. II Pet. 2: 6
126	Paed. iii. 12. 88 (304)	Luke 10: 28
127	Strom. i. 10. 54 (348)	I Cor. 8: 3

[a]Probably also practical.

TABLE 6--Continued

Thesis Page	Patristic Literature	New Testament
	Class B	
128	Strom. ii. 5. 22 (440)	John 8: 34
129	Strom. v. 3. 18 (656)	I Cor. 9: 22
130	Strom. vii. 11. 68 (873)	Eph. 4: 13
131	Strom. vii. 12. 70 (874)	I Cor. 13: 7

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

We have quoted lists of variants in this thesis which Goguel has found significant. His statement regarding these and other variants of this variety is significant enough to be quoted here. The statement is as follows:

> The examination of the few examples of variants which we have quoted here leads us to suggest two observations. The first is that in all those of the second type, that is to say, in all those which are in relation with the peculiar character of the New Testament, it is not necessary to see accidents, fortuitous deformations of the texts, but rather the effect of latent forces which tended toward the elaboration of the New Testament, with a view to a more complete adaptation (or what was held to be a more complete adaptation), to the needs of the Church.
>
> And here is the second observation: In the cases which we have cited, the corruption of the text is perhaps illuminated because it is repeated only in a more or less numerous group of manuscripts, and so there remains a point of comparison which makes possible the disclosure. But it is certain that the work of deformation must have begun before the age when the manuscripts of the New Testament were already numerous enough so that a correction made in a text or in a group of texts did not run the risk of being spread throughout the entire tradition. And it must also be added that the further back we go the more the copyists must have felt themselves at liberty to make these corrections and adaptations because it was their duty; fewer then than in later times were hindered by the notion of respect for a sacred text. Then, it is possible and exceedingly probable that there are a number of corrections and adaptations in the text of the New Testament which, lacking a basis for comparison, it is impossible for us to recognize. We pass by them without suspecting their existence. This is doubtless of such a nature as to inspire the most serious doubts regarding the certitude that we shall ever be able to possess the very letter, the ipsissima verba of the New Testament writers.[1]

The emphasis which this discussion has placed on the motivating forces that were present in the second century to modify the New Testament text is a phase of the new insight which is de-

---

[1]Maurice Goguel, Le texte et les éditions du Nouveau Testament grec (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1920), p. 67.

veloping as to the place of internal evidence in the method of restoring the original autographs. The emphasis in textual criticism has been on the external evidence of manuscripts, specifically on the genealogical method. This method was subscribed to by Westcott and Hort but never really practised by them. As a matter of fact it is not possible to do so from the very nature of the history of the transmission of manuscripts. For the textual critic must recognize and take account of mixture in the process. The symmetrical genealogical trees of the handbooks on textual criticism are an over-simplification of an exceedingly complicated process of interaction among the manuscripts in their descent.

In all probability the emphasis on method must be reversed. The attitude toward internal evidence as being too subjective must be repudiated. In fact the genealogical method which was lauded because of its objectivity must be accused of the same subjectivity. For the evidence of documents presupposes judgment as to the value of the documents. And the estimate of documents is built up on the basis of internal evidence. And since, in any case, mixture is fatal to the genealogical method, the alternative must be accepted. This method will take into proper account the forces operating to produce variation, especially those of doctrine.

In conclusion, it might be well to summarize some of the values which emerge from this study. The summary follows:

1. A recognition of the importance of the social and religious situation and its close relationship to the New Testament text. Hence, textual criticism is related to "the organic life of the Christian community."

2. A recognition of the "fluid" state of the New Testament text during the first and early second centuries.

3. The recognition of the bearing of certain theories held by the ancients on the transmission of the text. These theories were (1) that Scripture must never contradict itself, and (2) that it was the duty of scribes to make "corrections" in the text. To "correct" a text often meant that it must be brought into harmony with ideas received in the Church.

4. On the basis of the foregoing no violation of propriety was involved.

5. The recognition of the necessity of taking motivation into proper account in any attempt to reconstruct the original

autographs.

6. A recognition of the place and importance of an analysis of motivation resulting in the identification of specific kinds of motivation.

7. Each of the resulting categories may be utilized as a tool in the hands of the textual critic.

8. A recognition of the fact that the early Fathers are important not only as witnesses for the text prior to them but because they affected the text after them and at the same time illustrate the processes of non-accidental variation.

9. A recognition of the scope of the forces making for non-accidental variation.

10. A recognition of the fact that canonicity did not guarantee the purity of the sacred text, but in some degree served the opposite purpose.

11. The cumulative effect is to stress the importance of motivation in the production of variation in the New Testament text.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Augustine. Enchiridion.

Altaner, Berthold. Patrologie. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder and Company, 1938.

Barnard, P. Mordaunt. The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899.

Bludau, August. Die Schriftfälschungen der Häretiker. Aschendorf, 1925.

Bousset, Wilhelm. Evangeliencitate Justins des Martyrers. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1891.

Case, Shirley Jackson. The Social Triumph of the Ancient Church. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1933.

Colwell, Ernest Cadman. Study of the Bible. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937.

Cone, Orello. Gospel Cricitism and Historical Christianity. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1891.

Cumont, Franz. The Mysteries of Mithras. Translated by Thomas J. McCormack. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1910.

De Faye, Eugène. Clement d'Alexandrie. Paris: Publiée sous les auspices du ministère de l'instruction publique, 1898.

Epiphanius. Against Heresies.

Eusebius. Ecclesiastic History.

Findlay, A. F. Byways in Early Christian Literature. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1923.

Gaius. Against Marcion.

Goguel, Maurice. Le texte et les éditions du Nouveau Testament grec. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1920.

Goodenough, E. R. The Theology of Justin Martyr. Jena: Verlag Frommannache Buchhandlung, 1923.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. Die ältesten Apologeten. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1914.

Gregory, C. R. Canon and Text of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1907.

Harnack, Adolf von. The Origin of the New Testament. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925.

_____. Studien zur Geschichte des Neven Testaments und der alten Kirche. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Company, 1931.

Harris, J. Rendel. The Diatessaron of Tatian. London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1890.

_____. A Study of Codex Bezae. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1891.

Hill, J. Hamlyn. The Earliest Life of Christ. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1894.

Hitchcock, F. R. M. Clement of Alexandria. London: Richard Clay and Sons, 1899.

Hort, F. J. A., and Mayor, J. B. Clement of Alexandria. New York: Macmillan Company, 1902.

Hoskier, H. C. Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910.

_____. Codex B and Its Allies. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914.

Irenaeus. Against Heresies.

Jacquier, E. Le Nouveau Testament dans l'Église chrétienne. Vol. II. Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1913.

Kaye, John. Apology of Justin Martyr. Edinburgh: J. Grant, 1912.

Kutter, Hermann. Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament. Giessen: J. Ricker, 1897.

Lagrange, M. J. Critique Textuelle. Vol. II. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1935.

Lake, Kirsopp. The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament. Oxford: Parker and Son, 1904.

Lightfoot, J. B. Notes on Epistles of Saint Paul from Unpublished Commentaries. New York: Macmillan Company, 1895.

Meifort, Joachim. Der Platonismus bei Clemens Alexandrinus. 1928.

Middleton, Thomas F. Doctrine of the Greek Article. London: J. G. F. and J. Rivington, 1841.

Nestle, Eberhard. Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament. London: Williams and Norgate, 1901.

Origen. Commentary on John.

_____. Commentary on Matthew.

Patrick, John. Clement of Alexandria. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1914.

Purves, G. T. The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity. New York: A. D. F. Randolph and Company, 1889.

Resch, Alfred. Agrapha. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.

_____. Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien. Vol. X. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897.

Reville, Jean. Études publiées en homage à la faculté de théologie de Montauban. 1901.

Sanday, William. The Gospels in the Second Century. London: Macmillan Company, 1876.

Schaff, Philip. A Companion to the Greek Testament and English Version. New York: Hayes and Brothers, 1894.

Scrivener, F. H. A. A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament. Vol. II. New York: George Bell and Sons, 1894.

Soden, Hermann von. Die Schriften des Neven Testaments. Berlin: Alexander Duncker, 1902-13.

Souter, Alexander. The Text and Canon of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1913.

Sozomen. Ecclesiastical History.

Stählin, Otto. Clemens Alexandrinus. Erster Band, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1905. Zweiter Band, 1906. Dritter Band, 1909. Vierter Band, 1936.

Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925.

Tertullian. Against Marcion.

_____. Against the Jews.

Tollinton, R. B. Clement of Alexandria. Vols. I and II. London: Williams and Norgate, 1914.

_____. Selections from the Commentaries and Homilies of Origen. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929.

Tregelles, Samuel P. The Printed Text of the Greek New Testament. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1854.

Turner, Cuthbert H. The Study of the New Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924.

Vaganay, Léon. An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Translated by B. V. Miller. London: Sands and Company Limited, 1937.

Vincent, M. R. Word Studies. Vol. I. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1890.

Westcott, B. F. The Canon of the New Testament. Cambridge: The Macmillan Company, 1889.

Westcott, B. F., and Hort, F. J. The New Testament in the Original Greek. Vol. II. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882.

Whitney, Samuel W. The Revisers' Greek Text. Vols. I and II. Boston: Silver, Burdett and Company, 1892.

Willoughby, Harold R. Pagan Regeneration. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Articles

Howard, Wilbert F. "The Influence of Doctrine upon the Text of the New Testament," The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (January, 1941), pp. 1-16.

Riddle, Donald W. "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline," Anglican Theological Review, Vol. XVIII (October, 1936).